**Evidence Table E-11. Comparison between iso- and low-osmolar contrast media: Image quality and diagnostic accuracy**

| **Author, year** | **Outcome** | **Measure** | **Sub-group (not a subgroup is column is left blank)** | **Interven-tion** | **ARM** | **Time Point 1**  |  **Time point 1 N anal-yzed** | **n (%) with out-come at time point 1** | **Comp-arison statistics at time point 1** | **Time Point 2**  | **Time point 2 N analyzed**  | **N(%) with out-come at time point 2** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 2** | **Time Point 3**  | **Time point 3 N anal-yzed**  | **n (%) with out-come at time point 3** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 3** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Image quality (resolution/contrast)** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nie, 200817 | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | Grade 1 is optimal, providing optimal informa- tion for making an unequivocal radiological diagnosis |   | Iodixanol | 2 | during procedure  | 106 | 75 (70.8) | p=NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nie, 200817 | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | Grade 1 is optimal, providing optimal informa- tion for making an unequivocal radiological diagnosis |   | Iopromide | 3 |  | 102 | 81 (79.4) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Evidence Table E-11. Comparison between iso- and low-osmolar contrast media: Image quality and diagnostic accuracy (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, year** | **Outcome** | **Measure** | **Sub-group (not a subgroup is column is left blank)** | **Interven-tion** | **ARM** | **Time Point 1**  |  **Time point 1 N anal-yzed** | **n (%) with out-come at time point 1** | **Comp-arison statistics at time point 1** | **Time Point 2**  | **Time point 2 N analyzed**  | **N(%) with out-come at time point 2** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 2** | **Time Point 3**  | **Time point 3 N anal-yzed**  | **n (%) with out-come at time point 3** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 3** | **Comment** |
| Nie, 200817 | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | Grade 2 is suboptimal, providing less than optimal in- formation for making a diagnosis (this category was used if the diagnostic quality was less than optimal in any aspect, even if a diagnosis could be made); |   | Iodixanol | 2 | during procedure  | 106 | 21 (19.8) | p=0.353 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Evidence Table E-11. Comparison between iso- and low-osmolar contrast media: Image quality and diagnostic accuracy (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, year** | **Outcome** | **Measure** | **Sub-group (not a subgroup is column is left blank)** | **Interven-tion** | **ARM** | **Time Point 1**  |  **Time point 1 N anal-yzed** | **n (%) with out-come at time point 1** | **Comp-arison statistics at time point 1** | **Time Point 2**  | **Time point 2 N analyzed**  | **N(%) with out-come at time point 2** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 2** | **Time Point 3**  | **Time point 3 N anal-yzed**  | **n (%) with out-come at time point 3** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 3** | **Comment** |
| Nie, 200817 (continued) | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | Grade 2 is suboptimal, providing less than optimal in- formation for making a diagnosis (this category was used if the diagnostic quality was less than optimal in any aspect, even if a diagnosis could be made); |   | Iopromide | 3 |  | 102 | 14 (13.7) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Nie, 200817 | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | Grade 3 is not diagnostic, providing insufficient information to make a radiological diagnosis |   | Iodixanol | 2 | during procedure  | 106 | 10 (9.4) | p=NR |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Evidence Table E-11. Comparison between iso- and low-osmolar contrast media: Image quality and diagnostic accuracy (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, year** | **Outcome** | **Measure** | **Sub-group (not a subgroup is column is left blank)** | **Interven-tion** | **ARM** | **Time Point 1**  |  **Time point 1 N anal-yzed** | **n (%) with out-come at time point 1** | **Comp-arison statistics at time point 1** | **Time Point 2**  | **Time point 2 N analyzed**  | **N(%) with out-come at time point 2** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 2** | **Time Point 3**  | **Time point 3 N anal-yzed**  | **n (%) with out-come at time point 3** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 3** | **Comment** |
| Nie, 200817 (continued) | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | Grade 3 is not diagnostic, providing insufficient information to make a radiological diagnosis |   | Iopromide | 3 |  | 102 | 7 (6.9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zo’o, 201122 | Image quality (resolution/contrast) | “Good” |  | Iodixanol | 2 |  | 66 | 59 (89.4) | P=0.73 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | For both groups image quality was judged poor or moderate in patients with a high BMI or who did not receive sufficient dose of contrast media |
| Zo’o, 201122 |  |  |  | Iobitridol | 3 |  | 62 | 52 (83/9) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

**Evidence Table E-11. Comparison between iso- and low-osmolar contrast media: Image quality and diagnostic accuracy (continued)**

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Author, year** | **Outcome** | **Measure** | **Sub-group (not a subgroup is column is left blank)** | **Interven-tion** | **ARM** | **Time Point 1**  |  **Time point 1 N anal-yzed** | **n (%) with out-come at time point 1** | **Comp-arison statistics at time point 1** | **Time Point 2**  | **Time point 2 N analyzed**  | **N(%) with out-come at time point 2** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 2** | **Time Point 3**  | **Time point 3 N anal-yzed**  | **n (%) with out-come at time point 3** | **Com-parison statistics at time point 3** | **Comment** |
| **Diagnostic efficacy** |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zo’o, 201122 | Diagnostic efficacy | “easy” |  | Iodixanol |  |  | 66 | 65 (98.5) | P=0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Zo’o, 201122 |  |  |  | Iobitridol |  |  | 62 | 56 (90.2) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

%=percent, AE=Adverse Events, CI=Confidence Interval, CIN=Contrast Induced Nephropathy, ClCr=Creatinine Clearance, cr=Creatinine, eGFR=estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate, ESRD=End Stage Renal Diseasem, H=Hours, Hrs=Hours, IA=Intra-arterial, Mg/dl=milligrams per deciliter, MI=Myocardial Infarction, Ml=milliliter, N=Sample size, NR=Not Reported, NR=Not reported, Ns=Not significant, P=p-value, PCI=percutaneous coronary intervention, SCr=Serum Creatinine, Umol/L=micromole per liter