Clinical Use of Tranexamic Acid in High Tibial Osteotomy

A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Zheshu Xu,*[†] MD, Lixun Li,[‡] MD, Peng Xie,^{†§} MD, Juyuan Gu,*[†] MD, Kai Kang,*[†] MD, and Xiaozuo Zheng,*^{†||} MD Investigation performed at Third Hospital of Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang, Hebei, China

Background: High tibial osteotomy (HTO) can cause postoperative hemorrhage. The use of tranexamic acid to reduce the hemorrhage is still controversial.

Purpose: To investigate the efficacy and safety of tranexamic acid in HTO.

Study Design: Systematic review; Level of evidence, 4.

Methods: Using PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines, the authors conducted a comprehensive search of the Embase, Cochrane Library, PubMed, Web of Science, MEDLINE, and Foreign Medical Literature Retrieval Service databases between their inception and January 1, 2023. All clinical studies comparing the use of tranexamic acid versus no tranexamic acid during HTO were collected. The primary outcome measures were hemoglobin decrease, drainage volume, and blood loss, and the secondary outcome measures were wound complications, blood transfusion, and postoperative thrombosis. All indicators were analyzed using meta-analysis software. Results were reported as mean differences or risk ratios with 95% confidence intervals.

Results: Of 152 initial results, 9 studies involving 908 patients were included. The tranexamic acid group had lower indicators for total blood loss, hemoglobin decrease, and total drainage volume (P < .00001 for all). There were no differences between patients with versus without tranexamic acid in wound complications, including hematoma (P = .21) or infection (P = .18), nor were there any group differences in the prevalence of blood transfusion (P = .21) or postoperative thrombosis (P = .36).

Conclusion: Tranexamic acid was able to effectively reduce postoperative hemorrhage in patients undergoing HTO without affecting the rates of wound complications, blood transfusion, or postoperative thrombosis.

Keywords: high tibial osteotomy; tranexamic acid; meta-analysis

High tibial osteotomy (HTO) redistributes the strength of the knee joint to the normal anatomic site by correcting the alignment of the lower extremity through osteotomy, to slow down the degenerative changes of the knee joint, which is beneficial to the treatment of osteoarthritis with abnormal alignment. Therefore, as a part of the step-bystep treatment of knee osteoarthritis, HTO has become an active and effective treatment before knee arthroplasty.

At the same time, HTO is accompanied by many postoperative complications and risks. 4,17 Because of the involved

osteotomy correction, the bone space needs to be opened during the HTO procedure. This causes soft tissue damage around the surgical site and inevitable vascular damage.²⁶ During the perioperative period, it is accompanied by hemorrhage, which leads to local complications of the wound, such as local hematoma, delayed healing, osteofascial compartment syndrome, and even superficial wound infection.^{11,23,35} These postoperative complications and risks will affect the patient's early functional recovery and increase the economic burden. In order to better improve the prognosis, in recent years, many surgeons have used tranexamic acid (TXA) in HTO.

TXA is a synthetic analog of the amino acid lysine in its chemical structure, and it acts mainly by competitively blocking the lysine binding site of plasminogen as an

The Orthopaedic Journal of Sports Medicine, 12(3), 23259671241231761 DOI: 10.1177/23259671241231761 © The Author(s) 2024

This open-access article is published and distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution - NonCommercial - No Derivatives License (https://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits the noncommercial use, distribution, and reproduction of the article in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. You may not alter, transform, or build upon this article without the permission of the Author(s). For article reuse guidelines, please visit SAGE's website at http://www.sagepub.com/journals-permissions.

antifibrinolytic drug.⁵ TXA has been shown to reduce blood loss in other orthopaedic procedures, such as total knee arthroplasty,^{15,38} total hip replacement,^{1,40} and periacetabular osteotomy.^{18,39} In addition, TXA can reduce hemorrhage during orthopaedic surgery at various doses without increasing the risk of thrombosis.^{7,12,43} Current modes of administration of TXA include intravenous (IV), topical, or oral.^{30,34,41} The clinical applications of TXA have not been widely studied and recognized in HTO.

In this study, we aimed to investigate the efficacy and safety of TXA in HTO. It was hypothesized that TXA would effectively reduce postoperative hemorrhage in patients undergoing HTO and it would not affect the prevalence of wound complications, blood transfusion, or postoperative thrombosis.

METHODS

Search Strategy

This systematic review was conducted according to the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) guidelines. The comprehensive retrieval of studies from the Embase, Cochrane Library, PubMed, Web of Science, MEDLINE, and Foreign Medical Literature Retrieval Service databases was conducted by 2 independent reviewers (Z.X. and L.L.) between their inception and January 1, 2023. The search terms for retrieval were as follows: "Tranexamic Acid or Tranexamic Acid [MeSH] or TXA" and "tibia* or tibia[MeSH]" and "osteotom* or osteotomy[MeSH]." References of included studies were searched to avoid missing relevant studies. The search process did not restrict the language and country of the publication.

Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

The inclusion criteria for studies were as follows: (1) patients who received opening-wedge HTO; (2) intervention group received application of TXA; (3) control group received placebo; (4) primary indicators of comparative results were hemoglobin decrease, drainage volume, and blood loss, with other indicators including wound complications, blood transfusion, and postoperative thrombosis; and (5) studies were comparable in design. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (1) patients who did not receive HTO or received HTO in combination with multiple other

surgeries; (2) no blank control group; (3) no postoperative bleeding-related indicators were involved in the results; (4) non-English-language articles; and (5) reviews, commentaries, or cell experiment articles. All duplicate studies were removed.

Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Data extraction and quality assessment were performed independently by 2 reviewers (Z.X. and L.L.). Any disputes were resolved through discussions with all members of the group. The following data were retrieved: first author, study design, sample size, general patient information, the primary indicators of comparative results, and the other results. The primary outcome measures were hemoglobin decrease, drainage volume, and blood loss, and the secondary outcome measures were the prevalence of wound complications, blood transfusion, and postoperative thrombosis.

The Cochrane Collaboration's risk of bias tool was used to assess the quality of prospective comparative studies. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) was used to assess the quality of retrospective comparative studies.

Statistical Analysis

Data between the TXA and control groups were analyzed using Review Manager 5.3 of the Cochrane Collaboration Group. Risk ratios (RRs) with 95% confidence intervals were calculated for dichotomous variables, and mean differences (MDs) with 95% confidence intervals were calculated for continuous variables. The P value and I^2 statistic were used to assess heterogeneity by standard chi-square test. When $I^2 < 50\%$ or $P \ge .1$, the fixed-effects model was adopted. If this condition could not be met, the random-effects model was adopted. We also performed subgroup analyses according to the method of TXA administration.

RESULTS

Literature Search and Selection

The process of retrieval is shown in Figure 1. A total of 152 studies were included in the preliminary search of various databases. After screening, 9 studies[¶] including 908

[¶]References 4, 6, 16, 17, 21, 24, 28, 31, 33.

^{II}Address correspondence to Xiaozuo Zheng, MD, Department of Orthopedics, Hebei Medical University Third Hospital, 139 Ziqiang Road, Shijiazhuang, Hebei 050051, China (email: xiaozuo_zheng@163.com).

^{*}Department of Orthopedics, Hebei Medical University Third Hospital, Shijiazhuang, Hebei, China.

[†]Key Laboratory of Biomechanics of Hebei Province, Shijiazhuang, Hebei, China.

[‡]Department of Orthopedics, Hebei Province Special Care Hospital, Shijiazhuang, Hebei, China.

[§]Department of Nuclear Medicine, Third Hospital of Hebei Medical University, Shijiazhuang, Hebei, China.

Final revision submitted June 23, 2023; accepted August 16, 2023.

One or more of the authors has declared the following potential conflict of interest or source of funding: Funding has been received from the Natural Science Foundation of Hebei Province (No. H2021206279), the Medical Science of Hebei Province (No. 20210324), the Project of Human Resources and Social Security of Hebei Province (No. C20190184), and the Training Project of Excellent Clinical Talent funded by the Government of Hebei Provincial Finance Department (for 2020). AOSSM checks author disclosures against the Open Payments Database (OPD). AOSSM has not conducted an independent investigation on the OPD and disclaims any liability or responsibility relating thereto.



Figure 1. PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) flowchart of the study selection process. HTO, high tibial osteotomy; TXA, tranexamic acid.

patients were selected. There were 3 prospective comparative studies^{17,24,31} and 6 retrospective comparative studies.^{4,6,16,21,28,33} As for the method of TXA administration, 2 studies^{6,21} opted for combined IV/topical application, 1 study⁴ used IV or topical application, 1 study³³ used topical application, and 5 studies^{16,17,24,28,31} used IV application.

Quality Assessment

The quality of the 3 prospective comparative studies as assessed by the "deviation risk" of the Cochrane Collaboration is shown in Figure 2. The NOS scores of the 6 retrospective comparative studies as assessed by the NOS are shown in Table 1; 2 studies scored 8 and 4 studies scored 7, indicating good quality overall.

Characteristics of the Included Studies

Baseline information is presented in Table 2. The methods used to assess thrombosis in the studies included in the meta-analysis are shown in Table 3.

Total Blood Loss

Total blood loss after HTO was evaluated in 7 included studies^{4,6,16,17,21,24,28} involving 881 patients (Figure 3). The heterogeneity of the studies was statistically significant (P < .00001; $I^2 = 87\%$). Significant differences were



Figure 2. Assessment of quality for the prospective comparative studies according to the Cochrane risk of bias tool. Green indicates low risk of bias, yellow indicates unclear risk of bias, and red indicates high risk of bias.

found between the TXA and control groups in total blood loss (MD, -273.96; 95% CI, -326.57 to -221.35; P < .00001). The results of the subgroup analysis according to method of TXA administration were as follows: IV (MD, -326.38; 95% CI, -393.01 to -259.75; P < .00001), topical (MD, -209.00; 95% CI, -288.45 to -129.55; P < .00001), and combined IV/topical (MD, -188.44; 95% CI, -383.33 to 6.45; P = .06). No significant differences were found among the subgroups (P = .06).

Drainage Volume

Six studies^{4,16,17,24,28,33} reported postoperative day (POD) 1 drainage volume (Figure 4A), of which 3 studies^{4,16,33} reported POD2 drainage volume (Figure 4B). Eight studies^{4,16,17,21,24,28,31,33} reported data on total drainage volume (Figure 4C).

The heterogeneity of studies with POD1 drainage volume was statistically significant (P < .00001; $I^2 = 96\%$), and significant differences were found between the TXA and control groups (MD, -129.50; 95% CI, -172.36 to -86.64; P < .00001). The results of the subgroup analysis were as follows: IV (MD, -139.66; 95% CI, -175.47 to -103.86; P < .00001) and topical (MD, -96.80; 95% CI, -134.56 to -59.03; P < .00001), with no significant differences found among the subgroups (P = .11).

The heterogeneity of studies with POD2 drainage volume was not significant (P = .52; $I^2 = 0\%$), and no significant differences were found between the TXA and control groups (MD, -2.82; 95% CI, -6.44 to 0.81; P = .13). The results of the subgroup analysis were as follows: IV (MD,

Study	Select	ion Items	s (max 4	points)	Comparability (max 2 points)	Outcome/Exp	posure Items (r		
	1	2	3	4		5	6	7	Total (max 9 points) ^{b}
Bian (2021) ⁴	*	*	*	*	*	*	* *	*	8
Chen (2020) ⁶	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	_	7
Kim (2018) ¹⁶	*	*	*	*	*	_	*	*	7
Luo (2022) ²¹	*	*	*	*	**	*	_	_	7
Palanisamy (2018) ²⁸	*	*	*	*	**	*	_	_	7
Suh (2018) ³³	*	*	*	*	**	*	*	_	8

^aNewcastle-Ottawa Scale items: 1 = representativeness of the exposed cohort; 2 = selection of the nonexposed cohort; 3 = ascertainment of exposure; 4 = demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study; 5 = assessment of outcome; 6 = was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur; 7 = adequacy of follow-up of cohorts. Dash represents no point.

^bScoring: Good quality = 3 or 4 stars in selection domain and 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain and 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain. Fair quality = 2 stars in selection domain and 1 or 2 stars in comparability domain and 2 or 3 stars in outcome/exposure domain. Poor quality = 0 or 1 star in selection domain or 0 stars in comparability domain or 0 or 1 star in outcome/exposure domain.

TABLE 2

Baseline Characteristics of the Included Studies^a BMI, kg/m² Sex, Male/Female Sample Size Age, y Study All TXA Control TXA TXA TXA Control Control Control Bian $(2021)^4$ 191 IV: 72 55 IV: 25 ± 4 24 ± 3 IV: 56 \pm 5 56 ± 6 IV: 13/59 10/45Topical: 64 Topical: 25 ± 4 Topical: 54 \pm 7 Topical: 9/55 Chen $(2020)^6$ 52 IV/topical^b 27.3 ± 4.0 100 48 $28.5\,\pm\,4.2$ 58.3 ± 10.4 56.6 ± 10.2 20/3222/26Kim (2018)¹⁶ 15075 IV 75 $26.3\,\pm\,3.1\mathrm{I}$ 26.4 ± 2.6 55.0 ± 6.8 55.7 ± 5.5 17/5814/61Kim (2021)¹⁷ 7337 IV 36 54.9 ± 9.2 55.3 ± 7.0 10/279/27 Luo (2022)²¹ 60 30 IV/topical^b 30 26.6 ± 2.9 $27.6\,\pm\,3.0$ 60.3 ± 2.6 60.5 ± 2.7 19/1120/10Ni $(2020)^{24}$ 23.2 ± 1.5 52.5 ± 2.8 100 50 IV 50 23.5 ± 1.3 52.9 ± 3.1 10/4012/38Palanisamy (2018)²⁸ 15266 IV 86 $27\,\pm\,2$ 26 ± 2 58 ± 5 57 ± 6 7/599/77 52.9 ± 7.1 Petersen (2022)³¹ 26 IV 26 51.1 ± 6.9 15/115216/10Suh (2018)³³ 30 15 topical 15 28.1 ± 3.9 26.1 ± 2.7 60 ± 5.6 56 ± 5.7 3/124/11

 a Data are reported as mean \pm SD or No. of patients. Dashes indicate data not available. BMI, body mass index; IV, intravenous; TXA, tranexamic acid.

^bCombined intravenous and topical.

TABLE 3 Methods of Evaluating Thrombosis

Study	Method
Bian (2021) ⁴	No routine screening. Doppler ultrasound applied when thrombotic symptoms present.
Chen (2020) ⁶	Doppler ultrasound applied when thrombosis was suspected or before discharge.
Kim (2018) ¹⁶	Routine computed tomography venography on postoperative day 5. Doppler ultrasound applied when thrombotic symptoms present.
Luo (2022) ²¹	Doppler ultrasound applied when thrombosis was suspected.
Ni (2020) ²⁴	Routine Doppler ultrasound on postoperative day 5. Examination performed when thrombotic symptoms were found during follow-up.
Palanisamy (2018) ²⁸	No routine screening. Thrombosis data collected from outpatient follow-up records.
Petersen (2022) ³¹	The Wells score was applied to evaluate the risk of thrombosis, and Doppler ultrasound applied for screening when the score ≥ 2 .



Figure 3. Forest plot of studies on total blood loss. IV, inverse variance; TXA, tranexamic acid.

-3.68; 95% CI, -8.53 to 1.17; P = .14) and topical (MD, -1.73; 95% CI, -7.18 to 3.71; P = .53), with no significant differences found among the subgroups (P = .60).

The heterogeneity of studies on total drainage volume was statistically significant (P < .00001; $I^2 = 95\%$), and significant differences were found between the TXA and control groups (MD, -147.28; 95% CI, -192.64 to -101.92; P < .00001). The results of the subgroup analysis were as follows: IV (MD, -157.69; 95% CI, -208.05 to -107.33; P < .00001), topical (MD, -89.74; 95% CI, -102.73 to -76.76; P < .00001), and combined IV/topical (MD, -164.50; 95% CI, -194.27 to -134.73; P < .00001). Significant differences were found among the subgroups.

Hemoglobin Decrease

The decrease in hemoglobin was reported on POD1 in 4 studies^{16,17,24,33} (Figure 5A), on POD2 in 5 studies^{16,17,24,28,31} (Figure 5B), and on POD5 in 3 studies^{16,17,24} (Figure 5C).

The heterogeneity of studies on POD1 hemoglobin decrease was statistically significant (P = .10; $I^2 = 51\%$), and significant differences were found between the TXA and control groups (MD, -0.91; 95% CI, -1.20 to -0.61; P < .00001). There were significant differences in the subgroup analysis: IV (MD, -0.99; 95% CI, -1.31 to -0.67; P < .00001) and topical (MD, -0.60; 95% CI, -1.07 to -0.13; P = .01). No significant differences were found between the 2 subgroups (P = .17).

The heterogeneity of studies with POD2 hemoglobin decrease was not significant (P = .43; $I^2 = 0\%$). There were significant differences in POD2 hemoglobin decrease between the TXA and control groups (MD, -0.95; 95% CI, -1.11 to -0.79; P < .00001). Similarly, the heterogeneity

of studies with POD5 hemoglobin decrease was not significant (P = .18; $I^2 = 41\%$), and there were significant differences in POD5 hemoglobin decrease between the TXA and control groups (MD, -1.01; 95% CI, -1.27 to -0.75; P < .00001).

Wound Complications

Eight studies monitored wound complications, including hematoma (Figure 6A) and infection (Figure 6B).^{4,6,17,21,24,28,31,33}

The heterogeneity of hematoma studies was not significant (P = .91; $I^2 = 0\%$), and there were no differences between the TXA and control groups (RR, 0.53; 95% CI, 0.20-1.42; P = .21). Subgroup analysis indicated differences according to TXA administration: IV (RR, 0.54; 95% CI, 0.10-2.94; P = .48), topical (RR, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.13-6.62; P = .94), and combined IV/topical (RR, 0.37; 95% CI, 0.08-1.81; P = .22).

The heterogeneity of infection studies was not significant (P = .95; $I^2 = 0\%$), and there were no significant differences in infection between TXA and controls (RR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.17-1.39; P = .18). Subgroup analysis indicated no significant differences: IV (RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.14-2.46; P = .47), topical (RR, 0.29; 95% CI, 0.01 to 6.91; P = .44), and combined IV/topical (RR, 0.41; 95% CI, 0.06-2.70; P = .35).

Postoperative Thrombosis

Seven studies^{4,6,6,21,24,28,31} provided data on postoperative thrombosis (Figure 7). Postoperative thrombosis was found only in the study of Chen et al.⁶ There was no difference in the prevalence of postoperative thrombosis between TXA and controls (RR, 0.46; 95% CI, 0.09-2.41; P = .36).



Figure 4. Forest plots of studies on (A) postoperative day (POD) 1 drainage volume, (B) POD2 drainage volume, and (C) total drainage volume. IV, inverse variance; TXA, tranexamic acid.

A Study or Subgroup		XA SD	Total		ntrol SD	Total	Weight	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl
Intravenous Kim 2018 ¹⁶ Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:		0.8 1.1 hi² = 3			1.3	75 36 50 161); I²= 5	28.7% 27.8% 21.6% 78.1 % 50%	-1.20 [-1.55, -0.85] -0.70 [-1.07, -0.33] -1.10 [-1.57, -0.63] - 0.99 [-1.31, -0.67]	-+- ◆
Topical Suh 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:			15 15 0.01)	1.7	0.6	15 15	21.9% 21.9 %	-0.60 [-1.07, -0.13] - 0.60 [-1.07, -0.13]	•
Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe	Z = 6.06	(P <	0.0000	1)		l); l² = 6		-0.91 [-1.20, -0.61]	-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
В		TXA			ontrol			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI
Intravenous Kim 2018 ¹⁶ Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	1.5 2.6 1.3 1 3.84, df			2.4 3.3 2.2 2.3 3); I ² = 0	1.1 1.5 1.1 0.8	36 50 86 26	16.4% 8.0% 40.9% 15.5%	-0.90 [-1.27, -0.53] -0.90 [-1.30, -0.50] -0.70 [-1.27, -0.13] -0.90 [-1.15, -0.65] -1.30 [-1.71, -0.89] - 0.95 [-1.11, -0.79]	
Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Chi ^z = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff	Z=11.5	52 (P	< 0.000	001)	%	273	100.0%	-0.95 [-1.11, -0.79]	-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
C		IXA	T-4-1		ontrol		18/	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup Intravenous Kim 2018 ¹⁶ Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect:	1.8 1.7 1.9 3.41, df	1.1 0.9 1 = 2 (75 37 50 162 P = 0.1	3.1 2.4 2.9 8); i² = 4	1.6 1.1 1.2	75 36 50	34.1% 30.8% 35.1%	IV, Fixed, 95% CI -1.30 [-1.74, -0.86] -0.70 [-1.16, -0.24] -1.00 [-1.43, -0.57] -1.01 [-1.27, -0.75]	
Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diff	Z=7.72	? (P <	0.0000	01)	1%	161	100.0%	-1.01 [-1.27, -0.75]	-2 -1 0 1 2 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Figure 5. Forest plots of studies on hemoglobin decrease at (A) postoperative day (POD) 1, (B) POD2, and (C) POD5. IV, inverse variance; TXA, tranexamic acid.

Blood Transfusion

Eight studies reported data on blood transfusion (Figure 8).^{4,6,16,17,21,24,28,31} The heterogeneity of blood transfusion studies was not significant (P = .82; $I^2 = 0\%$). There were no differences in prevalence of blood transfusion between TXA and controls (RR, 0.25; 95% CI, 0.03-2.21; P = .21).

DISCUSSION

The study findings indicated that TXA reduced postoperative hemorrhage in HTO and did not affect the prevalence of wound complications, blood transfusion, or postoperative thrombosis.

TXA has widespread application in orthopaedic surgery, and related studies have confirmed that TXA could reduce postoperative hemorrhage.^{8,9,25,36} TXA reduced blood loss in knee surgery, especially total knee arthroplasty.^{10,19,29,37} In this meta-analysis, TXA significantly reduced postoperative hemorrhage, including total blood loss, hemoglobin decrease, and total drainage volume. Significant differences were found among the 2 groups, and the TXA group had lower indicators: total blood loss, hemoglobin decrease, and total drainage volume (P < .00001 for all). Among them, TXA effectively reduced the drainage volume of POD1 (P < .00001) but failed to significantly reduce the drainage volume of POD2 (P = .13). This is because there was more hemorrhage in POD1 and the effect of TXA was more significant. In terms of total hemorrhage, the clinical effect of TXA was worthy of recognition. Besides, wound complications, including hematoma (P = .21) and infection (P = .18), had no difference between the 2 groups. No difference was found in postoperative thrombosis (P = .36) and blood transfusion (P = .21).

A	TXA	Tatal	Contro			Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Iotal	Events	Iotal	weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Intravenous Bian 2021 ⁴	0	70	0			Net estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷	0 0	72 37	0 0	55 36		Not estimable Not estimable	
Ni 2020 ²⁴	0	50	1	50 50	13.6%	0.33 [0.01, 7.99]	
Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸	0					0.33 [0.01, 7.99]	
Petersen 2022 ³¹	1	66 26	1	86 26	11.8% 9.1%	1.00 [0.07, 15.15]	
Subtotal (95% CI)	1	20 251	1	253	9.1% 34.5%	0.54 [0.10, 2.94]	
	1	201	3	200	J4.J /0	0.54 [0.10, 2.54]	
Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	-	(D - 0		<u>00/</u>			
Test for overall effect: 2		•		0 /0			
		••••	-)				
Topical							
Bian 2021 ⁴	1	64	0	55	4.9%	2.58 [0.11, 62.19]	
Suh 2018 ³³	0	15	1	15	13.6%	0.33 [0.01, 7.58]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		79		70	18.4%	0.93 [0.13, 6.62]	
Total events	1	(5)	1	00/			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2				0%			
Intravenous & Topica	al						
Chen 2020 ⁶	2	52	5	48	47.1%	0.37 [0.08, 1.81]	
Luo 2022 ²¹	0	30	0	30		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		82		78	47.1%	0.37 [0.08, 1.81]	
Total events	2		5				
Heterogeneity: Not app	licable						
Test for overall effect: 2		9 = 0.22	2)				
T (1/05% O))					100.00/	0.50.50.00.4.401	
Total (95% CI)		412		401	100.0%	0.53 [0.20, 1.42]	
Total events	4		9	• • •			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	,	•		0%		0.005	0.1 1 10 200
Test for overall effect: 2			,	(D 0	70) 12 0	Fav	ours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subgroup differ	rences: Cr	u* = 0.:	51. df = 2	(P = 0)	.78). 1* = 0	%	
В	ТХА		Contr			Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Intravenous							
Bian 2021 ⁴	0	72	1	55	16.6%	0.26 [0.01, 6.16]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷	0 1	72 37	1 0	55 36	16.6% 5.0%	0.26 [0.01, 6.16] 2.92 [0.12, 69.43]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴	1 0	37 50	0 1		5.0% 14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸	1 0 0	37 50 66	0 1 1	36 50 86	5.0%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹	1 0	37 50 66 26	0 1	36 50 86 26	5.0% 14.7% 12.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI)	1 0 0	37 50 66	0 1 1 0	36 50 86	5.0% 14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	1 0 0 1	37 50 66 26 251	0 1 1 0 3	36 50 86 26 253	5.0% 14.7% 12.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3	37 50 66 26 251 3 (P = 0	0 1 0 3 0.70); I ² =	36 50 86 26 253	5.0% 14.7% 12.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3	37 50 66 26 251 3 (P = 0	0 1 0 3 0.70); I ² =	36 50 86 26 253	5.0% 14.7% 12.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3	37 50 66 26 251 3 (P = 0	0 1 0 3 0.70); I ² =	36 50 86 26 253	5.0% 14.7% 12.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3	37 50 66 26 251 3 (P = 0	0 1 0 3 0.70); I ² =	36 50 86 26 253	5.0% 14.7% 12.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F	37 50 66 26 251 8 (P = 0 2 = 0.4	0 1 0 0 0.70); I ² = 7)	36 50 86 26 253 0%	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴	1 0 0 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F 0	$37 \\ 50 \\ 66 \\ 26 \\ 251 \\ 8 (P = 0) \\ P = 0.4^{2} \\ 64$	0 1 1 0 3 0.70); I ² = 7) 1	36 50 86 253 0%	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46]	
Kim 2021^{17} Ni 2020^{24} Palanisamy 2018^{28} Petersen 2022^{31} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021^4 Sub 2018^{33} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	1 0 0 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F 0 0	37 50 66 26 251 3 (P = 0 2 = 0.4 64 15	0 1 1 0 3 0.70); I ² = 7) 1	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable	
Kim 2021^{17} Ni 2020^{24} Palanisamy 2018^{28} Petersen 2022^{31} Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021^4 Suh 2018^{33} Subtotal (95% CI)	1 0 0 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F 0 0 0	3750662518 (P = 0P = 0.4641579	0 1 1 0 3 0.70); I ² = 7) 1 0 1	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	3750662518 (P = 0P = 0.4641579	0 1 1 0 3 0.70); I ² = 7) 1 0 1	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Suh 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	$37 \\ 50 \\ 66 \\ 251 \\ 6 (P = 0) \\ 64 \\ 15 \\ 79 \\ P = 0.4$	0 1 1 0 0.70); l ² = 7) 1 0 1	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 \ (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	37 50 66 251 3 (P = 0 2 = 0.4 64 15 79 2 = 0.4 52	0 1 1 0 0 (7); ² = 7) 1 0 1 4) 2	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹	1 0 0 1 1.41, df = 3 Z = 0.72 (F 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	$37 \\ 50 \\ 66 \\ 26 \\ 251 \\ 6 (P = 0)^{2} = 0.4^{2} \\ 64 \\ 15 \\ 79 \\ 79 \\ 79 \\ 79 \\ 79 \\ 79 \\ 79 \\ 7$	0 1 1 0 0.70); l ² = 7) 1 0 1	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI)	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 \ (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	37 50 66 251 3 (P = 0 2 = 0.4 64 15 79 2 = 0.4 52	0 1 1 0 3 0.70); ² = 7) 1 0 1 4) 2 1	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 \ (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 37\\ 50\\ 66\\ 26\\ 251\\ 9=0.4\\ 15\\ 79\\ 9=0.4\\ 52\\ 30\\ 82\\ \end{array}$	0 1 1 0 3 0.70); ² = 7) 1 0 1 4) 2 1 3	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30 78	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 4 Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 37\\ 50\\ 66\\ 251\\ 9=0.4\\ 15\\ 79\\ 9=0.4\\ 52\\ 30\\ 82\\ (P=0\\ (P=0\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0.70); \ ^{2} = \\ 7) \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 4) \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 0.87); \ ^{2} = \\ \end{array}$	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30 78	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87] 0.41 [0.06, 2.70]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 37\\ 50\\ 66\\ 251\\ 9=0.4\\ 15\\ 79\\ 9=0.4\\ 52\\ 30\\ 82\\ (P=0\\ (P=0\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 10\\ 1$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0.70); \ ^{2} = \\ 7) \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 4) \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 0.87); \ ^{2} = \\ \end{array}$	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30 78	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 37\\ 50\\ 66\\ 26\\ 251 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0.70); \ ^{2} = \\ 7) \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 4) \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 0.87); \ ^{2} = \\ \end{array}$	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30 78	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7% 35.1%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87] 0.41 [0.06, 2.70]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 37\\ 50\\ 66\\ 26\\ 251 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} (P = (0) \\ P = 0.4 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 64\\ 15\\ 79 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} P = 0.4 \\ 52\\ 30\\ 82 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} (P = (0) \\ P = 0.3 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 412 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0.70); \ ^{2} = \\ 7) \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 4) \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 0.87); \ ^{2} = \\ 5) \end{array}$	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30 78 0% 401	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7% 35.1%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87] 0.41 [0.06, 2.70]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷ Ni 2020 ²⁴ Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸ Petersen 2022 ³¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1 Test for overall effect: 2 Topical Bian 2021 ⁴ Sub 2018 ³³ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect: 2 Intravenous & Topica Chen 2020 ⁶ Luo 2022 ²¹ Subtotal (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0 Test for overall effect: 2	$\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 1.41, df = 3 \\ Z = 0.72 (F \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ $	$\begin{array}{c} 37\\ 50\\ 66\\ 26\\ 251 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} (P = (0) \\ P = 0.4 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 64\\ 15\\ 79 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} P = 0.4 \\ 52\\ 30\\ 82 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} (P = (0) \\ P = 0.3 \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 412 \end{array}$	$\begin{array}{c} 0 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0.70); \ ^{2} = \\ 7) \end{array}$ $\begin{array}{c} 3 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 4) \\ 2 \\ 1 \\ 3 \\ 0.87); \ ^{2} = \\ 5) \end{array}$	36 50 86 253 0% 55 15 70 48 30 78 0% 401	5.0% 14.7% 12.8% 49.1% 15.8% 15.8% 20.4% 14.7% 35.1%	2.92 [0.12, 69.43] 0.33 [0.01, 7.99] 0.43 [0.02, 10.46] Not estimable 0.59 [0.14, 2.46] 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] Not estimable 0.29 [0.01, 6.91] 0.46 [0.04, 4.93] 0.33 [0.01, 7.87] 0.41 [0.06, 2.70] 0.48 [0.17, 1.39]	

Figure 6. Forest plots of studies on (A) hematoma and (B) infection. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; TXA, tranexamic acid.

	TXA		Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Intravenous							
Bian 2021 ⁴	0	72	0	55		Not estimable	
Kim 2018 ¹⁶	0	75	0	75		Not estimable	
Ni 2020 ²⁴	0	50	0	50		Not estimable	
Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸	0	66	0	86		Not estimable	
Petersen 2022 ³¹	0	26	0	26		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		289		292		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Not appli	cable					
Topical							
Bian 2021 ⁴	0	64	0	55		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		64		55		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Not appli	cable					
Intravenous & Topie	cal						
Chen 2020 6	2	52	4	48	100.0%	0.46 [0.09, 2.41]	
Luo 2022 ²¹	0	30	0	30		Not estimable	—
Subtotal (95% CI)		82		78	100.0%	0.46 [0.09, 2.41]	
Total events	2		4				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.92 ((P = 0.3	6)				
Total (95% Cl)		435		425	100.0%	0.46 [0.09, 2.41]	
Total events	2		4				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	_		-				
Test for overall effect:		Έ = Ο ?	(6)				0.02 0.1 i 10 50
Test for subgroup diff							Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
. corror oungroup un	0.0110003.	. tor app	01100010				

Figure 7. Forest plot of studies on postoperative thrombosis prevalence. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; TXA, tranexamic acid.

	TXA		Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Intravenous							
Bian 2021 ⁴	0	72	0	55		Not estimable	
Kim 2018 ¹⁶	0	75	2	75	62.5%	0.20 [0.01, 4.10]	
Kim 2021 ¹⁷	0	37	0	36		Not estimable	
Ni 2020 ²⁴	0	50	1	50	37.5%	0.33 [0.01, 7.99]	
Palanisamy 2018 ²⁸	0	66	0	86		Not estimable	
Petersen 2022 ³¹	0	26	0	26		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		326		328	100.0%	0.25 [0.03, 2.21]	
Total events	0		3				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.05, df =	1 (P =	0.82); l ² =	= 0%			
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.25 ((P = 0.2)	21)				
Topical							
Bian 2021 ⁴	0	64	0	55 55		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		64		55		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap							
Test for overall effect:	Not appli	cable					
Intravenous & Topic	al						
Chen 2020 6		52	0	48		Not estimable	
Luo 2022 ²¹	0	30	Ō	30		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)	-	82	•	78		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	nlicable		-				
Test for overall effect:		cable					
Total (95% CI)		472		461	100.0%	0.25 [0.03, 2.21]	
Total events	0		3				
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =		•		= 0%			
Test for overall effect:						0.0	Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subgroup diff	erences:	Not ap	plicable				r areare [experimental] - r areare [control]

Figure 8. Forest plot of studies on blood transfusion prevalence. M-H, Mantel-Haenszel; TXA, tranexamic acid.

Our subgroup analysis of hemorrhage-related outcomes according to TXA administration route showed that either IV or topical application was able to effectively reduce total blood loss (P < .00001 for both), but combined IV/topical application did not lead to significant differences compared with controls (P = .06). Subgroup analysis also showed that total drainage volume was reduced after TXA through all 3 routes of administration (P < .00001 for all). The reasons for the different hemorrhage-related results mainly came from the study of Chen et al.⁶ Compared with other included studies, the amount of postoperative hemorrhage reported by Chen et al⁶ was less, and the effect of TXA was less significant than in other studies. This could be related to the differences in TXA medication regimens and perioperative hemostasis management. When total blood loss from the Chen et al⁶ study was excluded, the subgroup analysis led to the following conclusions: the IV route and the combined IV/topical route were superior to the topical route in improving hemorrhage, and although the difference was not significant, it did exist.

Several studies have shown that TXA after HTO or distal femoral osteotomy reduces hemoglobin decrease.^{6,16,24,28,32,33} Our analysis indicated that TXA was able to effectively improve postoperative hemoglobin level, which could help reduce the incidence of postoperative anemia. At POD1, POD2, and POD5, TXA was found to effectively improve hemoglobin decrease. However, we found no advantage of TXA in terms of the prevalence of blood transfusion. Our results indicated that moderate heterogeneity was found in the meta-analysis of hemoglobin decrease on POD1 (P = .10; $I^2 = 51\%$). Based on the subgroup analysis using a randomeffects model, there was a significant improvement for POD1 hemoglobin with either IV or topical administration. Although there was no significant difference in the effect of the 2 routes of administration, it was observed that IV administration was more advantageous than the topical route.

The meta-analysis for wound complications included data from 8 studies^{4,6,17,21,24,28,31,33} and indicated that TXA had no effect on wound complications, including hematoma and infection. Subgroup analysis according to different administration methods showed that there was no difference within each subgroup. Similarly, a meta-analysis analyzing the management of wound complications of osteotomy found that TXA did little to reduce wound complications.³⁹ However, Ma et al²² noted a significant reduction in wound complications after applying TXA. There is still no consensus on the effect of TXA on wound complications in HTO.

TXA did not significantly increase the prevalence of postoperative thrombosis, which was reported in 7 studies.^{4,6,16,21,24,28,31} Of these, only 1 study⁶ showed thrombotic events, in 2 patients in the TXA group and 4 patients in the control group. The optimal dose of TXA was considered safe based on its mechanism of action, which inhibited only wound fibrinolysis and did not affect the systemic circulatory system.³ In fact, reviews have indicated that many studies have shown that TXA had no effect on thrombosis,^{2,14} which is reliable for the clinical use of TXA.

It is clear that, as previously mentioned, there are many studies with different results and much controversy regarding wound complications and postoperative thrombosis. In HTO, the effects of TXA were different among different routes of administration, although not statistically significant. This difference should not be overlooked. In fact, in other orthopaedic procedures, some studies proved the advantages of TXA through the IV combined with topical route over the IV or topical route alone.^{13,20,27} In addition, a meta-analysis indicated that a single dose of IV-administered TXA was superior to a single dose of topically administered TXA.⁴² More studies are needed to draw accurate and significant conclusions on these issues.

We did not conduct a meta-analysis on the dose of TXA administration because the dose of TXA varies. As for the IV route, 2 studies used repeated IV 2 doses of 2 g TXA,^{17,28} and Kim et al¹⁶ used repeated IV 3 doses of 10 mg/kg TXA. Three other studies used single doses of 1 g,³¹ 10 mg/kg,⁴ and 50 mg/kg,²⁴ respectively. As for the topical route, the regimens were single doses of 2 g³³ and 10 mg/kg⁴, respectively. As for the IV combined with topical route, Chen et al⁶ used 1 g IV combined with 1 g topical administration. Luo et al²¹ used repeated doses of 1 g twice by IV route, combined with 3 g topical administration. All these different dose regimens can reduce the postoperative hemorrhage, but there are no studies comparing the effects of different regimens in HTO.

Limitations

Several limitations exist in this review. As there are still few published articles about TXA during the HTO perioperative period, we were only able to include 3 prospective comparative studies and 6 retrospective comparative studies. Second, although subgroup analyses were performed for different administration routes, each subgroup included fewer studies and inevitably increased bias. Studies with larger sample sizes and longer follow-up are needed to improve statistical confidence because of the lower rates of some indicators such as blood transfusion and postoperative thrombosis.

CONCLUSION

Our systematic review demonstrated that TXA could effectively reduce postoperative hemorrhage in HTO, and it did not affect wound complications, blood transfusion, and postoperative thrombosis.

REFERENCES

- Akti S, Zeybek H, Bilekli AB, et al. The effect of tranexamic acid on hidden blood loss in total hip arthroplasty. *Joint Dis Relat Surg.* 2022;33(1):102-108.
- Alshryda S, Sukeik M, Sarda P, et al. A systematic review and metaanalysis of the topical administration of tranexamic acid in total hip and knee replacement. *Bone Joint J.* 2014;96-B(8):1005-1015.

- Benoni G, Lethagen S, Fredin H. The effect of tranexamic acid on local and plasma fibrinolysis during total knee arthroplasty. *Thromb Res.* 1997;85(3):195-206.
- Bian J, Deng B, Wang Z, et al. Comparison of topical and intravenous tranexamic acid for high tibial osteotomy: a retrospective study. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2021;100(32):e26884.
- Camarasa MA, Ollé G, Serra-Prat M, et al. Efficacy of aminocaproic, tranexamic acids in the control of bleeding during total knee replacement: a randomized clinical trial. Br J Anaesth. 2006;96(5):576-582.
- Chen DS, Zhu JW, Wang TF, Zhu B, Feng CH. Tranexamic acid is beneficial to patients undergoing open-wedge high tibial osteotomy. *Biomed Res Int*. 2020;2020:2514207.
- Cid J, Lozano M. Tranexamic acid reduces allogeneic red cell transfusions in patients undergoing total knee arthroplasty: results of a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Transfusion*. 2005;45(8):1302-1307.
- Cornelius B, Moody K, Hopper K, et al. A retrospective study of transfusion requirements in trauma patients receiving tranexamic acid. *J Trauma Nurs*. 2019;26(3):128-133.
- Dai WL, Zhou AG, Zhang H, Zhang J. Most effective regimen of tranexamic acid for reducing bleeding and transfusions in primary total knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. J Knee Surg. 2018;31(7):654-663.
- Fillingham YA, Ramkumar DB, Jevsevar DS, et al. The efficacy of tranexamic acid in total knee arthroplasty: a network meta-analysis. J Arthroplasty. 2018;33(10):3090-3098.e1.
- Han SB, In Y, Oh KJ, et al. Complications associated with medial opening-wedge high tibial osteotomy using a locking plate: a multicenter study. J Arthroplasty. 2019;34(3):439-445.
- Ho KM, Ismail H. Use of intravenous tranexamic acid to reduce allogeneic blood transfusion in total hip and knee arthroplasty: a metaanalysis. *Anaesth Intensive Care*. 2003;31(5):529-537.
- Jia J. Combined use of intravenous and topical tranexamic acid in patients aged over 70 years old undergoing total hip arthroplasty. J Orthop Surg Res. 2019;14(1):345.
- Kagoma YK, Crowther MA, Douketis J, et al. Use of antifibrinolytic therapy to reduce transfusion in patients undergoing orthopedic surgery: a systematic review of randomized trials. *Thromb Res.* 2009;123(5):687-696.
- Kang BX, Li YL, Xu H, et al. Effect of multiple doses of intravenous tranexamic acid on perioperative blood loss in total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled study. *Orthop Surg.* 2021;13(1):126-133.
- Kim KI, Kim HJ, Kim GB, Bae SH. Tranexamic acid is effective for blood management in open-wedge high tibial osteotomy. *Orthop Traumatol Surg Res.* 2018;104(7):1003-1007.
- Kim M, Koh I, Sung Y, et al. Intravenous tranexamic acid has benefit for reducing blood loss after open-wedge high tibial osteotomy: a randomized controlled trial. J Clin Med. 2021;10(15):3272.
- Levack AE, McLawhorn AS, Dodwell E, et al. Intravenous tranexamic acid reduces blood loss and transfusion requirements after periacetabular osteotomy. *Bone Joint J.* 2020;102-B(9):1151-1157.
- Liu Q, Geng P, Shi L, Wang Q, Wang P. Tranexamic acid versus aminocaproic acid for blood management after total knee and total hip arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Surg.* 2018;54(pt A):105-112.
- Lu F, Sun X, Wang W, Zhang Q, Guo W. What is the ideal route of administration of tranexamic acid in total knee arthroplasty? A meta-analysis based on randomized controlled trials. *Ann Palliat Med.* 2021;10(2):1880-1894.
- Luo W, Fu X, Huang JM, Wu J, Ma XL. Efficacy and safety of intravenous combined with topical administration of tranexamic acid in reducing blood loss in opening wedge high tibial osteotomy procedure: a retrospective case-control study. *Acta Orthop Traumatol*. 2022;56(2):100-104.
- Ma J, Lu H, Chen X, Wang D, Wang Q. The efficacy and safety of tranexamic acid in high tibial osteotomy: a systematic review and metaanalysis. J Orthop Surg Res. 2021;16(1):373.
- Martin R, Birmingham TB, Willits K, et al. Adverse event rates and classifications in medial opening wedge high tibial osteotomy. *Am J Sports Med.* 2014;42(5):1118-1126.

- Ni J, Liu J, Zhang J, et al. Tranexamic acid is beneficial for blood management of high tibial osteotomy: a randomized controlled study. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2020;141(9):1463-1472.
- Nugent M, May JH, Parker JD, et al. Does tranexamic acid reduce knee swelling and improve early function following arthroscopic meniscectomy? A double-blind randomized controlled trial. Orthop J Sports Med. 2019;7(8):2325967119866122.
- Ogbemudia AO, Bafor A, West-Osemwengie L. Reactionary haemorrhage reduction with adrenaline infiltration in proximal tibial osteotomy: a randomized clinical study of safety and efficacy. Arch Orthop Trauma Surg. 2012;132(1):21-24.
- 27. Örs Ç, Çaylak R. The efficacy, safety, and cost-effectives of combined administration of intravenous and local tranexamic acid in the management of patients undergoing primary total hip arthroplasty: a prospective, blinded and randomized clinical study. Acta Orthop Traumatol. 2021;55(5):422-427.
- Palanisamy JV, Das S, Moon KH, Kim DH, Kim TK. Intravenous tranexamic acid reduces postoperative blood loss after high tibial osteotomy. *Clin Orthop Relat Res.* 2018;476(11):2148-2154.
- Peng Zhang MM, Jifeng Li MM, Xiao Wang MM. Combined versus single application of tranexamic acid in total knee and hip arthroplasty: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Int J Surg.* 2017;43:171-180.
- Perreault RE, Fournier CA, Mattingly DA, Junghans RP, Talmo CT. Oral tranexamic acid reduces transfusions in total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2017;32(10):2990-2994.
- Petersen W, Bentzin M, Bierke S, Park HU, H, Ner M. Use of tranexamic acid in medial open wedge high tibial osteotomy. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2022;142(9):2287-2293.
- Steinhaus ME, Buksbaum J, Eisenman A, et al. Tranexamic acid reduces postoperative blood loss in distal femoral osteotomy. J Knee Surg. 2020;33(5):440-444.
- Suh DW, Kyung BS, Han SB, Cheong K, Lee WH. Efficacy of tranexamic acid for hemostasis in patients undergoing high tibial osteotomy. *J Knee Surg.* 2018;31(1):50-55.
- Wang Z, Shen X. The efficacy of combined intra-articular and intravenous tranexamic acid for blood loss in primary total knee arthroplasty: a meta-analysis. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2017;96(42):e8123.
- Woodacre T, Ricketts M, Evans JT, et al. Complications associated with opening wedge high tibial osteotomy—a review of the literature and of 15 years of experience. *Knee*. 2016;23(2):276-282.
- Xiao C, Zhang S, Long N, Yu W, Jiang Y. Is intravenous tranexamic acid effective and safe during hip fracture surgery? An updated meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Orthop Trauma Surg.* 2019;139(7):893-902.
- Xie J, Hu Q, Huang Q, et al. Comparison of intravenous versus topical tranexamic acid in primary total hip and knee arthroplasty: an updated meta-analysis. *Thromb Res.* 2017;153:28-36.
- Xue CX, Yao YF, Lv H, Cheng L, Jing JH. Efficacy and safety of postoperative intravenous tranexamic acid in total knee arthroplasty: a prospective randomized controlled study. *Orthop Surg.* 2021;13(8):2227-2235.
- Yao RZ, Gao WQ, Wang BW, et al. Efficacy and safety of tranexamic acid in reducing blood loss of lower extremity osteotomy in periacetabulum and high tibia: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Orthop Surg.* 2019;11(4):545-551.
- Zha GC, Zhu XR, Wang L, Li HW. Tranexamic acid reduces blood loss in primary total hip arthroplasty performed using the direct anterior approach: a one-center retrospective observational study. J Orthop Traumatol. 2022;23(1):12.
- Zhang LK, Ma JX, Kuang MJ, et al. The efficacy of tranexamic acid using oral administration in total knee arthroplasty: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Orthop Surg Res*. 2017;12(1):159.
- 42. Zheng C, Ma J, Xu J, et al. The optimal regimen, efficacy and safety of tranexamic acid and aminocaproic acid to reduce bleeding for patients after total hip arthroplasty: a systematic review and Bayesian network meta-analysis. *Thromb Res.* 2023;221:120-129.
- Zohar E, Ellis M, Ifrach N, et al. The postoperative blood-sparing efficacy of oral versus intravenous tranexamic acid after total knee replacement. *Anesth Analg.* 2004;99(6):1679-1683.