



Comparison of Clinical Outcome between Craniectomy and Craniotomy as Surgical Management of Traumatic Acute Subdural Hematoma: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis

Tjokorda Gde Bagus Mahadewa^{1*}, Putu Eka Mardhika¹, Sri Maliawan¹, Nyoman Golden¹, Steven Awyono¹, Christopher Ryalino²

¹Department of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia; ²Department of Anesthesiology, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Bali, Indonesia

Abstract

BACKGROUND: Acute subdural hematoma (ASDH) is a major problem in traumatic brain injury. Surgical techniques for treating ASDH are varied, including cranioplastic craniotomy and large decompressive craniectomy. The superiority of craniectomy and craniotomy for treating ASDH is still controversial.

AIM: The aim of this study was to compare the clinical outcome between craniectomy and craniotomy for treating traumatic ASDH through systematic review and meta-analysis.

METHODS: This study used electronic articles published in PubMed, EBSCO, Google Scholar, and Directory of Open Access Journal. Articles included were full-text observational studies in Indonesian or English. Clinical outcome using the Glasgow Outcome Scale was compared between craniectomy and craniotomy. Statistical analysis was done using Review Manager 5.3.

RESULTS: Six articles met our inclusion and exclusion criteria. We performed random effect model analysis because of high heterogeneity between studies ($l^2 = 77\%$; $X^2 = 21.98$). The pooled risk ratio between craniectomy and craniotomy on poor outcomes was 1.41 (p = 0.02; 95% Cl: 1.06–1.88).

CONCLUSION: Craniectomy increases the risk of poor clinical outcomes in treating a traumatic ASDH.

Edited by: Eli Djulejic Citation: Mahadewa TGB, Mardhika PE, Maliawan S, Golden N, Awyono S, Ryalino C. Comparison of Clinical Outcome between Craniectomy and Craniotomy as Surgical Management of Traumatic Acute Subdural Hematoma: A Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2020 Aug 30; 8(F):137-142. https://doi.org/10.3889/doamjms.2020.4282 Keywords: Craniotomy: Decompressive craniectomy; Glasgow Outcome Scale; Subdural hematoma: Traumatic brain injury *Correspondence: Tjokorda Gde Bagus Mahadewa, Department of Neurosurgery, Faculty of Medicine, Udayana University, Jl. PB Sudiman, Denpasar 80/32, Bali, Indonesia. E-mail: Ijokmahadewa@unud.ac.id Received: 08-Jan-2020 Revise: 14-Aug-2020 Accepted: 18-Aug-2020 Copyright: © 2020 Tjokorda Gde Bagus Mahadewa, Putu Eka Mardhika, Sri Maliawan, Nyoman Colden,

Copyright: © 2020 Tjokorda Gde Bagus Mahadewa, Putu Eka Mardhika, Sri Maliawan, Nyoman Golden, Steven Awyono, Christopher Ryalino Funding: This research did not receive any financial support

Competing Interest: The authors have declared that no competing interest exists Open Access: This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (CC BY-NC 4.0)

Introduction

Traumatic brain injury (TBI) is one of the major causes of mortality and permanent disability around the world. TBI is a spectrum of conditions ranging from a cerebral contusion to large intracranial hematoma [1]. Acute subdural hematoma (ASDH) is one of the major problems in TBI [2]. It is diagnosed with head CT scan as an extra-axial, crescentic hyperdense lesion between dura mater and brain parenchyma [2]. ASDH is a space-occupying lesion that increases intracranial pressure and usually accompanies with diffuse injuries, cerebral contusion, and edemas. Because of this, the mortality of ASDH remains high [2].

Management of ASDH is including operative and non-operative treatment. Non-operative management correlates with significantly higher mortality if compared to surgical management [3]. Surgical techniques for treating ASDH are varied. They include craniotomy and followed by cranioplasty, decompressive craniectomy, trephination/craniotomy, or combination of these procedures. Principally, the aim of the surgery is to relieve the brain from intracranial hypertension because of space-occupying lesion by the hematoma [4], [5]. Large craniotomy with hematoma evacuation could be a perfect choice to treat ASDH. However, when intraoperative brain swelling develops, decompressive craniectomy may be a better choice. However, based on a recent study in animals, bony decompression of the brain results in a reduction of intracranial pressure but enhances cold injury brain edema [4].

Based on what has been described, the superiority of craniectomy and craniotomy for treating ASDH is still controversial. This study aimed to compare the clinical outcome between craniectomy and craniotomy for treating traumatic ASDH through systematic review and meta-analysis.

Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2020 Aug 30; 8(F):137-142.

Methods

Eligibility criteria

Eligibility criteria were created based on the PICO framework. PICO criteria are shown in Table 1. Table 1: PICO criteria of the study

Patient	Traumatic ASDH
Intervention	Decompressive craniectomy
Comparator	Craniotomy
Outcome	Glasgow Outcome Scale

This review included all studies comparing decompressive craniectomy and craniotomy in traumatic ASDH patients. We exclude review, animal, anatomic, cadaveric, qualitative, and economic studies. Articles made by the same author in the same institution were performed sample evaluation to prevent sample duplication. We included studies published in Indonesian and English. Other languages were translated using Google translate and decided by author whether include them or not. There was no restriction regarding the year of publication.

This review included studies with adult participants (age 18 years or older) of both genders who have suffered traumatic SDH. ASDH was defined as a hematoma in potential space between dura mater and arachnoid that was confirmed by a crescentic hyperdense lesion in head CT scan following trauma. Participants of all nationalities and setting were included. Participants with other head injury or focal lesions were excluded from this review.

The reviewed surgical interventions were decompressive craniectomy and craniotomy. Decompressive craniectomy was defined as a procedure removing a portion of skull temporary after clot evacuation. A craniotomy was defined as a procedure to evacuate clot and followed by cranioplasty. We excluded studies that did not describe the surgical procedure and combine the technique of interest with other technique.

The investigated outcome in this review was the Glasgow Outcome Scale (GOS) after the surgical procedure. GOS was dichotomized into favorable and poor outcomes. Favorable outcome was defined as GOS 4–5, while poor outcome was defined as GOS 1–3.

Search strategy

We extracted the eligibility criteria (PICO) into keywords using the Boolean operator. In this study, we used keywords ([craniectomy] AND [craniotomy] AND [ASDH] AND [outcome]) in PubMed, EBSCO, Google Scholar, and Directory of Open Access Journal database to find the eligible studies.

The study selection process was performed by two authors (EM and SA) to reduce the possibility of discarding relevant studies. The decision of another author was used when a disagreement occurred. Duplicate records were removed. Titles and abstracts were screened, and irrelevant studies were removed. Studies that passed the first screening were further evaluated for the compliance of the inclusion and exclusion criteria of this review. Finally, the studies were further evaluated for their quality before included in this review.

Data collection process

An electronic data collection form was used to collect data from each author. The collected data by each author will be merged and be managed with software Review Manager 5.3.

Data items

The data items were the author's name, year of publication, method, sample size, diagnosis of the participant, age, surgical technique, and GOS. GOS was dichotomized into favorable and poor outcomes. They were calculated for risk ratio (RR) and were analyzed.

Assessment of quality of a study

Studies that complied with inclusion and exclusion criteria were assessed for their quality to ensure the validity and reliability of the studies. This process was done independently by two authors using a standardize critical appraisal tool to minimize the possibility of bias in study selection. The critical appraisal tool in this study was the Joanna Briggs Institute (JBI) critical appraisal tool based on study design. A decision of the third and fourth authors was used when a disagreement occurred.

The cutoff point was used to determine the quality of the study. The cutoff point in this review was half of the total score in each JBI critical appraisal checklist. The lowquality study was defined as a score below the cutoff point while conversely was termed as a high-quality study.

Synthesis of result

The RR of outcome was pooled and analyzed. Meta-analyses were performed using software Review Manager 5.3. The random-effect model was used because of high heterogeneity among studies.

Results

The systematic searching method resulted in six articles that met our inclusion and exclusion criteria

(Figure 1). All six articles were observational cohort studies. We did not find any randomized clinical trial study comparing craniotomy and craniectomy. All six articles were considered as good quality based on our judgment. The summary of finding and complete characteristic of the study is shown in Tables 2 and 3.

From random-effect model analysis with high heterogeneity ($l^2 = 77\%$; $X^2 = 21.98$), pooled RR



Figure 1: The PRISMA study flow diagram



between craniectomy and craniotomy on poor outcome was 1.41 (p = 0.02; 95% CI: 1.06-1) (Figure 2).

Discussion

TraumaticASDH is a major neurotrauma problem in the world. It causes primary brain damage because of direct compression to the brain and secondary damage mainly because of brain edema and ischemia due to compression. ASDH has been known for its high mortality rate. Several studies reported that initial GCS score, age, midline shift, and hematoma size are important clinical predictors of mortality [6], [7], [8], [9], [10].

The main objective of the surgical treatment is to relieve intracranial pressure by evacuating the hematoma with craniotomy followed by cranioplasty procedure. However, brain swelling can be uncontrolled during surgery, and cranioplasty cannot be done. Decompressive craniectomy seems to provide a better solution in that case because, in this procedure, the defect on the skull is kept open to provide "additional room" for the uncontrolled brain swelling, so the intracranial pressure remains normal. However, there is still debate which procedure provides a better outcome for traumatic ASDHs. At present, the surgical technique is based on the surgeon's preference.

From the pooled RR, we found that craniectomy provided worse outcomes compared to craniotomy as surgical treatment of traumatic ASDH. The pooled RR was 1.41 (p = 0.02), with high heterogeneity among studies. The result of this study is similar to other systematic reviews conducted by Phan *et al.* In their study, they found that craniectomy was associated with worse post-operative outcomes compared to craniotomy [11]. Based on our analysis of included studies, there are several factors that may contribute to the more unsatisfactory outcome of craniectomy for treating traumatic ASDH.

In a study by Tsermoulas *et al.*, patients who were performed decompressive craniectomy tend to

Study author	Type of study	Level of evidence	Subject condition	Intervention	n	Control	n	Outcome
Tsermoulas et al., 2016	Observational study,	1b	Patients above 16 years old with	CR	69	CO	30	CR: 41 poor outcome,
	prospective cohort		traumatic acute subdural hematoma					CO: 11 poor outcome
Chen <i>et al.</i> , 2011	Observational study,		Patients with GCS score 4–8 and	CR	60	CO	42	CR: 27 poor outcome,
	retrospective cohort		subdural hematoma with thickness >10					CO: 16 poor outcome
			mm or a midline shift >5 mm on CT scan					
Vilcinis et al., 2017	Observational study,	1b	All adult patients diagnosed with acute	CR	249	CO	394	CR: 212 poor outcome,
	prospective cohort		subdural hematoma causing brain					CO: 176 poor outcome
			compression on pre-operative CT scan					
Woertgen et al., 2006	Observational study,		Patients with traumatic acute subdural	CR	69	CO	111	CR: 41 poor outcome,
-	retrospective cohort		hematoma range 15–91 years old					CO: 59 poor outcome
Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012	Observational study,		All traumatic acute subdural hematoma	CR	50	CO	38	CR: 29 poor outcome,
	retrospective cohort		patients who underwent craniotomy or					CO: 21 poor outcome
			craniectomy					
Wong <i>et al.</i> , 2010	Observational study,		All traumatic acute subdural hematoma	CR	19	CO	22	CR: 12 poor outcome,
-	retrospective cohort		patients who underwent craniotomy or					CO: 7 poor outcome
			craniectomy					

Open Access Maced J Med Sci. 2020 Aug 30; 8(F):137-142.

Table 3: Characteristics of the studies

Surgery for acute subdural hematoma: Replace or remove the bone flap? (Tsermoulas et al., 2016) Methods Prospective cohort

Destininente	
Participants	Inclusion criteria
	Patient above 16 years old with traumatic acute subdural
	hematoma
	Lindenwent cranictomy or craniectomy
	Exclusion criteria
	Spontaneous acute subdural hematoma
	Craniotomies for subacute or chronic subdural hematomas
	Craniotomies for other types of injury
Intervention	Intervention group
Intervention	Decembración cremientemo 60 metiente
	Decompressive cramecionity. 09 patients
	Comparison group
	Craniotomy with fixed flap and riding flap: 30 patients
Outcomes	Primary outcome is Glasgow Outcome Scale at 6 months
Comparison of c	raniotomy and decompressive craniectomy in severely head injured
notionto with on	its subdural homotoma. (Chan at al. 2011)
patients with act	ile subdural hematoma. (Chen et al., 2011)
Methods	Retrospective cohort
Participants	Inclusion criteria
	Patient with GCS score of 4–8
	Subdural bematoma with thickness > 10 mm or midline shift >5 mm
	Suburiar nematoria with thickness > 10 min or midline shift > 0 min
	Exclusion criteria
	Patient older than 70 years
	Had preexisting illness that limited life expectancy of less than 1
	vear after ictus
	Ponel feilure
	Liver cirrhosis
	Bleeding tendency
	Penetrating injury
	Hemodynamic instability
	Inium >24 b before administration
	injury >24 n before admission
	Bilateral pupillary dilatation
	Previous neurologic condition
	Underwent surgery for contralateral lesion
	Patient with intracerebral bematoma larger than 2 cm in diameter
Intervention	Fater entire group
Intervention	Intervention group
	Decompressive craniectomy: 60 patients
	Comparison group
	Frontotemporoparietal craniotomy: 42 patients
Outcomes	Primary outcomes are GOS at minimum 1 year after surgery
The Association	of Curried Method with Outcomes of Acute Cubdural Llometeres
The Association	or Surgical Method with Outcomes of Acute Subdural Hematoma
Patients: Experie	ence with 643 Consecutive Patients. (Vilcinis et al., 2017)
Methods	Prospective cohort
Participants	Inclusion criteria
	Adult patients diagnosed with acute subdural hematoma causing
	Addit patients diagnosed with addite subdular hematoma causing
	brain compression on pre-operative CT scan
	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma
	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria
	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria
	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation
	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma
Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group
Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients
Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group
Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteonlastic cranietomy: 394 patients
Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary cutromes were GOS
Intervention Outcomes	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma.
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> ,	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006)
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> , Methods	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> , Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> , Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> , Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or
Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.,</i> Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty
Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> , Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.</i> , Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen <i>et al.,</i> Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Casteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS Primary outcomes were GOS Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ne evacuation of acute subdural hematomas: A comparison of cranietomy
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followi	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years g evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy view craniectomy (I i at 2 010)
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followin with decompress	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years mg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012)
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of co (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followin with decompress Methods	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followi with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria
Outcomes Comparison of c Weertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followin with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years mg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years mg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followin with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Province amprenet superiod acute subdural hematoma acute sub
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followi with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematomas: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followin with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: Exclusion criteria Intervention group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years mg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followi with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years mg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years of evacuation of acute subdural hematomas: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic evalution between patients
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematomas: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years rg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas Intervention group
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c Quertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy isve craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy 50 patients
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy: 50 patients Comparison group
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants Intervention	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years or exacution of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy 50 patients Comparison group Decompressive craniectomy: 50 patients Comparison group Craniotomy: 38 patients
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c Quertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Outcomes Participants	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years ng evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy isive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy: 50 patients Comparison group Decompressive craniectomy: 50 patients Comparison group Craniotomy: 38 patients Primary outcomes are GOS to 16 months
Intervention Outcomes Comparison of c (Woertgen et al., Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcome followii with decompress Methods Participants Intervention Outcomes Outcomes	Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Underwent secondary decompressive craniectomy after evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Intervention group Lateral or bifrontal decompressive craniectomy: 249 patients Comparison group Osteoplastic craniotomy: 394 patients Primary outcomes were GOS raniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural hematoma. 2006) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria Patient with traumatic acute subdural hematoma Underwent large craniotomy or decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty Exclusion criteria Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy with or without duraplasty: 69 patients Comparison group Large craniotomy: 111 patients Primary outcomes are GOS range from 4 months to 11 years mg evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: A comparison of craniotomy sive craniectomy. (Li <i>et al.</i> , 2012) Retrospective cohort Inclusion criteria All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who underwent craniotomy or craniectomy Require emergent surgical evacuation of acute subdural hematoma Exclusion criteria Non traumatic cases of acute subdural hematoma Mini craniotomies Acute on chronic subdural hematomas Intervention group Decompressive craniectomy: 50 patients Comparison group Craniotomy: 38 patients Primary outcomes are GOS at 6 months

Table 3: (Continued)

0	to any dimension of the second s					
Surgery for acute subdural hematoma: Replace or remove the bone flap? (Isermoulas						
et al., 2016)						
Assessing the r	neurological outcome of traumatic acute subdural hematoma patients with					
and without primary decompressive craniectomies. (Wong et al., 2010)						
Methods	Retrospective cohort					
Participants	Inclusion criteria					
	All patients with traumatic acute subdural hematoma who					
	underwent craniotomy or craniectomy					
	Exclusion criteria					
Intervention	Intervention group					
	Decompressive craniectomy: 19 patients					
	Comparison group					
	Craniotomy: 22 patients					
Outcomes	Primary outcomes are GOS at 6 months after injury					

have lower GCS, suffered more extracranial injuries, worse brain scans on admission, and worse prognostic score [12]. Vilcinis *et al.* [6] also have a similar result; patients with lower GCS score on admission, greater ASDH thickness, and midline shift tend to be performed craniectomy. Furthermore, Chen *et al.* stated that there was no difference of baseline characteristic of their study and found no significant difference of outcome between craniectomy and craniotomy [13].

The decision whether to perform craniectomy or craniotomy was surgeon dependent. However, intraoperative brain swelling after ASDH evacuation was an indicator to perform craniectomy also [6]. Craniectomy group tends to have a worse injury than craniectomy group. Patients who were performed craniectomy tend to have pupillary mydriasis and brain herniation. Brain herniation is a predictor of mortality in their study [14].

Li *et al.* reported that the operation technique was based on the surgeon's preference [15]. They reported that craniectomy tends to be performed in patients with obliteration of basal cistern and lower GCS score [15], [16]. Decompressive craniectomy tends to be performed on patients with worse conditions then craniotomy. Because of that, the result of this meta-analysis found that craniectomy has a poorer outcome if compared to craniotomy. We did not find an article that provides a similar baseline characteristic between craniotomy and craniectomy. This is the limitation of our study, so future studies should consider this problem.

Our meta-analysis result showed that craniectomy has a poorer outcome. However, this result should be interpreted cautiously because of high heterogeneity between studies, no randomized clinical trial study was included, and the possibility of baseline characteristic bias.

Based on our analysis, we suggested not to perform decompressive craniectomy as the primary first-line choice to treat ASDH. However, if brain edema is developing intraoperatively, the surgeon should perform a decompressive craniectomy immediately to prevent reoperation. Pre-operative midline shift, initial GCS, and presence of intraventricular hemorrhage can be predictors of post-craniectomy edema [17]. The first surgical planning for treating ASDH should be

	Craniec	tomy	ny Craniotomy		Risk Ratio		Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% CI
Chen 2011	27	60	16	42	14.7%	1.18 [0.73, 1.90]	
Li 2012	29	50	21	38	17.5%	1.05 [0.72, 1.52]	+
Tsermoulas 2016	41	69	11	30	13.9%	1.62 [0.97, 2.70]	
Vileinis 2017	212	249	176	394	23.6%	1.91 [1.69, 2.15]	
Woertgen 2006	41	69	59	111	20.4%	1.12 [0.86, 1.45]	+
Wong 2010	12	19	7	22	10.0%	1.98 [0.98, 4.00]	
Total (95% CI)		516		637	100.0%	1.41 [1.06, 1.88]	◆
Total events Heterogeneity: Tau² = Test for overall effect:	362 = 0.09; Ch : Z = 2.35	i ² = 21. (P = 0.	290 98, df = 02)	5 (P =	0.0005);	l ² = 77%	0.01 0.1 1 10 100

Figure 2: Forest plot comparing craniectomy and craniotomy. CI: Confidence interval; M-H: Mantel-Haenszel

done with craniotomy technique; however, the surgeon should make preparation to perform decompressive craniectomy when severe brain edema occurred.

Conclusion

Craniectomy increases the risk of poor clinical outcomes in treating traumatic ASDHs. However, the interpretation should be done cautiously because of high heterogeneity between studies, no randomized clinical trial study was included, and the possibility of baseline characteristic bias. We suggest that the first surgical planning for treating ASDH should be done with craniotomy technique; however, surgeons should make preparation to perform decompressive craniectomy when severe brain edema occurred.

References

- Vega RA, Valadka AB. Natural history of acute subdural hematoma. Neurosurg Clin North Am. 2017;28(2):247-55. PMid:28325459
- Karibe H, Hayashi T, Hirano T, Kameyama M, Nakagawa A, Tominaga T. Surgical management of traumatic acute subdural hematoma in adults: A review. Neurol Med Chir (Tokyo). 2014;54(11):887-94. https://doi.org/10.2176/nmc.cr.2014-0204 PMid:25367584
- Leitgeb J, Mauritz W, Brazinova A, Janciak I, Majdan M, Wilbacher I, *et al*. Outcome after severe brain trauma due to acute subdural hematoma. J Neurosurg. 2012;117(2):324-33. https://doi.org/10.3171/2012.4.jns111448 PMid:22631691
- Cooper PR, Hagler H, Clark K, Barnett P. Enhancement of experimental cerebral edema after decompressive craniectomy: Implications for the management of severe head injuries. Neurosurgery. 1979;4(4):296-300. https://doi. org/10.1097/00006123-197904000-00004 PMid:450227
- Wilberger JE Jr., Harris M, Diamond DL. Acute subdural hematoma: Morbidity, mortality, and operative timing. J Neurosurg. 1991;74(2):212-8. https://doi.org/10.3171/jns.1991.74.2.0212

PMid:1988590

- Vilcinis R, Bunevicius A, Tamasauskas A. The association of surgical method with outcomes of acute subdural hematoma patients: Experience with 643 consecutive patients. World Neurosurg. 1991;101:335-42. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2017.02.010
- Alagoz F, Yildirim AE, Sahinoglu M, Korkmaz M, Secer M, Celik H, *et al.* Traumatic acute subdural hematomas: Analysis of outcomes and predictive factors at a single center. Turk Neurosurg. 2017;27(2):187-91. https://doi.org/10.5137/1019-5149.jtn.20651-17.0 PMid:27593776
- Lenzi J, Caporlingua F, Caporlingua A, Anichini G, Nardone A, Passacantilli E, *et al.* Relevancy of positive trends in mortality and functional recovery after surgical treatment of acute subdural hematomas. Our 10-year experience. Br J Neurosurg. 2017;31(1):78-83. https://doi.org/10.1080/026886 97.2016.1226253

PMid:27596026

 Benedetto N, Gambacciani C, Montemurro N, Morganti R, Perrini P. Surgical management of acute subdural haematomas in elderly: Report of a single center experience. Br J Neurosurg. 2017;31(2):244-8. https://doi.org/10.1080/02 688697.2016.1244249

PMid:27760467

- Bartels RH, Meijer FJ, van der Hoeven H, Edwards M, Prokop M. Midline shift in relation to thickness of traumatic acute subdural hematoma predicts mortality. BMC Neurol. 2015;15:220. https:// doi.org/10.1186/s12883-015-0479-x PMid:26496765
- Phan K, Moore JM, Griessenauer C, Dmytriw AA, Scherman DB, Sheik-Ali S, *et al.* Craniotomy versus decompressive craniectomy for acute subdural hematoma: Systematic review and meta-analysis. World Neurosurg. 2017;101:677-85. https:// doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2017.03.024 PMid:28315797
- Tsermoulas G, Shah O, Wijesinghe HE, Silva AHD, Ramalingam SK, Belli A. Surgery for acute subdural hematoma: Replace or remove the bone flap? World Neurosurg. 2016;88:569-75. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wneu.2015.10.045 PMid:26523763
- Chen SH, Chen Y, Fang WK, Huang DW, Huang KC, Tseng SH. Comparison of craniotomy and decompressive craniectomy in severely head-injured patients with acute subdural hematoma. J Trauma. 2011;71(6):1632-6. https://doi.org/10.1097/ ta.0b013e3182367b3c
 PMid:22027888
- Woertgen C, Rothoerl RD, Schebesch KM, Albert R. Comparison of craniotomy and craniectomy in patients with acute subdural haematoma. J Clin Neurosci. 2006;13(7):718-21. https://doi. org/10.1016/j.jocn.2005.08.019
 PMid:16904897

- Li LM, Kolias AG, Guilfoyle MR, Timofeev I, Corteen EA, Pickard JD, *et al.* Outcome following evacuation of acute subdural haematomas: A comparison of craniotomy with decompressive craniectomy. Acta Neurochir (Wien). 2012;54(9):1555-61. https://doi.org/10.1007/s00701-012-1428-8 PMid:22752713
- 16. Wong GK, Hung YW, Chong C, Yeung J, Ng SC, Rainer T, *et al.* Assessing the neurological outcome of traumatic acute subdural hematoma patients with and without primary decompressive

craniectomies. Acta Neurochir Suppl. 2010;106:235-7. https:// doi.org/10.1007/978-3-211-98811-4_44 PMid:19812956

 Nguyen HS, Janich K, Sharma A, Patel M, Mueller W. To retain or remove the bone flap during evacuation of acute subdural hematoma: Factors associated with perioperative brain edema. World Neurosurg. 2016;95:85-90. https://doi.org/10.1016/j. wneu.2016.07.067 PMid:27476687