Table F-6. Methodological characteristics of Frequentist mixed treatment comparisons

| Author, year | Network model characteristics | Measure of heterogeneity, inconsistency and claims of equivalence or non-inferiority |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Anothaisin-tawee, 2011 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Mixed-effect hierarchical model with a log-link function using the “xtpoisson” command  Weighting of studies: Inverse variance  Adjustment for covariates:  Yes, effects of study were included as covariates  Was the raw data available? Yes, in manuscript  Software used: Stata 11.0 | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  Cochrane Q-statistic, I2 Heterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Compare results from traditional and network meta-analyses   Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Baldwin, 2011\* | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Frequentist framework using random effects  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? No  Software used: Stata 9 | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  NRHeterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Test for consistency between results of the direct meta-analysis and those of the mixed treatment meta-analyses by subtracting the odds ratios and using a t-test to identify differences in effect estimates between the two models  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Freemantle, 2011 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Random effects, non-linear mixed model based upon psuedoliklihood  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? Yes, in manuscript  Software used: SAS | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  NRHeterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  Covariance statistic and SE  Evaluation of inconsistency: Compare results from traditional and network meta-analyses   Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Singh, 2011 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Bayes Framework  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? Yes, in report  Software used: NR | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  NRHeterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  Tau2  Evaluation of inconsistency: NR  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Roskell, 2009 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  No  Model(s):  Bayes Framework  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  Length of follow-up   Was the raw data available? Yes, in online appendix  Software used: SAS | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  NAHeterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Compare results from MTC to previously published literature  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Trikalinos, 2009 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Two level linear mixed-effects model with heteroscedastic errors  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? Yes, in online appendix  Software used: R 2.6.0 nlme package | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  I2 Heterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Measured and reported network incoherence values  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Hansen, 2008 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Frequentist mixed-effects meta-regression  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? Yes, in online appendix  Software used: R code using Metafor package | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  I2 Heterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Compare results from network meta-analysis to previously published literature  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Elliot, 2007 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  “online program published by Lumely”   Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? Yes, in manuscript  Software used: R 1.14 framework 2.21 | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  Riley-Day testHeterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Measured and reported incoherence values  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |
| Eckert, 2006 | Was traditional meta-analysis run?  Yes  Model(s):  Bayes Framework  Weighting of studies: NR  Adjustment for covariates:  NR  Was the raw data available? Yes, in manuscript  Software used: SAS | Heterogeneity assessment in traditional meta-analysis:  NRHeterogeneity assessment in network meta-analysis:  NR  Evaluation of inconsistency: Compare results from MTC to previously published literature  Equivalence claims:  NR  Non-inferiority claims:  NR  Minimally important difference defined:  NA |

Abbreviations: NA= not applicable; NR=not reported; SE=standard error

\*: Includes both a Bayesian MTC model and a Frequentist MTC model therefore appears in both tables.