

APPENDIX 1. Checklists for reporting standards

PRISMA Checklist

Section/topic	#	Checklist item	Reported
TITLE			
Title	1	Identification as a systematic review, meta-analysis, or both.	✓
ABSTRACT			
Structured summary	2	Structured abstract including background, objectives, data sources, study eligibility criteria, methodological assessment, synthesis method, results, conclusions and implications of key findings.	✓
INTRODUCTION			
Rationale	3	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known.	✓
Objectives		Provide an explicit statement of questions being addressed with reference to participants, interventions, outcomes (PICO design).	✓
METHODS			
Protocol and registration	4	Indicate if a review protocol exists, and where it can be accessed.	✓
Eligibility criteria	5	Specify study characteristics and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) used as criteria for eligibility.	✓
Information sources	6	Describe all information sources (such as databases with dates of coverage, contact with study authors, experts) in the search, and the date of last search.	✓
Search	7	Present full electronic search strategy, including limits used, such that it could be repeated.	✓
Study selection	8	State the process for selecting studies (i.e., screening, eligibility) and make sure that this is done by 2 authors.	✓
Data collection	9	Describe method of data extraction from reports (e.g., piloted forms, independently, in duplicate) and any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	✓
Data items	10	List and define all variables for which data were sought (e.g., PICOS, funding sources) and any assumptions and simplifications made.	✓
Risk of bias in individual studies	11	Describe methods used for assessing risk of bias of individual studies (including specification of whether this was done at the study or outcome level), and how this information is to be used in any data synthesis.	✓
Summary measures	12	State the principal summary measures (e.g., risk ratio, difference in means).	✓
Synthesis of results	13	Describe the methods of handling data and combining results of studies, if done, including measures of consistency (e.g., I ²) for each meta-analysis.	✓
Risk of bias across studies	14	Specify any assessment of risk of bias that may affect the cumulative evidence (e.g., publication bias, selective reporting within studies).	✓
Additional analyses	15	Describe methods of additional analyses (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression), if done, indicating which were pre-specified.	✓
RESULTS			
Study selection	16	Give numbers of studies screened, assessed for eligibility, and included in the review, with reasons for exclusions at each stage, illustrated with a flow diagram.	✓
Study characteristics	18	For each study, present characteristics for which data were extracted (e.g., study size, PICOS, follow-up period) and provide the citations.	✓
Risk of bias within studies	19	Present data on risk of bias of each study and, if available, any outcome level assessment.	✓
Results of individual studies	20	For all outcomes considered (benefits or harms), present, for each study: (a) simple summary data for each intervention group (b) effect estimates and confidence intervals, ideally with a forest plot.	✓
Synthesis of results	21	Present results of each meta-analysis done, including confidence intervals and measures of consistency.	✓
Risk of bias across studies	22	Present results of any assessment of risk of bias across studies.	✓
Additional analysis	23	Give results of additional analyses, if done (e.g., sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression).	✓
DISCUSSION			
Summary of evidence	24	Summarize the main findings including the strength of evidence for each main outcome; consider their relevance to key groups (e.g., healthcare providers, users, and policy makers).	✓
Limitations	25	Discuss limitations at study and outcome level (e.g., risk of bias), and at review-level (e.g., incomplete retrieval of identified research, reporting bias).	✓
Conclusions	26	Provide a general interpretation of the results in the context of other evidence, and implications for future research.	✓
FUNDING			
Funding	27	Describe sources of funding for the systematic review and other support (e.g., supply of data); role of funders for the systematic review.	✓

APPENDIX 2. Search strategies

OVID Medline and Embase

- 1. Gamma knife surgery/
- 2. Gamma knife/
- 3. GKRS/
- 4. GKS/
- 5. GK/
- 6. Radiosurg*/
- 7. Stereotactic
- 8. 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7
- 9. Arteriovenous Malformation/
- 10. AVM
- 11. 9 or 10
- 12. 8 and 11
- 13. (brain* or cerebral or intracerebral or central nervous system or intracranial or cerebellar or intraventricular or supratentorial).tw.
- 14. 12 and 13 (English language only)

Number of references identified: 3402
Last date searched: October 17, 2021

Open Grey

- 1. arteriovenous malformation
- 2. AVM
- 3. radiosurgery

Number of references identified: 41
Last date searched: October 17, 2021

Cochrane

- 1. cerebral arteriovenous malformation or cerebral arteriovenous malformations or intracranial arteriovenous malformations or AVM
- 2. stereotactic or radiosurgery or gamma knife
- 3. 1 and 2

Number of references identified: 48
Last date searched: October 17, 2021

APPENDIX 3. Excluded studies, with the reasons for their exclusion

First author, year of publication	No access/Non-english/Not full paper	Study period pre- 1989	No original data or review	<20 patients / < 1 year FU	No reporting of demographic data (Age/ Nidus volume/ Dose)	No reporting of location/SM/ Presentation	No reporting of clinical outcomes of interest (Obliteration/ Haemorrhage/ RICs)	LINAC/ Cyberknife/ Repeat GK/ Multi-stage GKRS	Superseded by another study
Abecassis et al. 2017					*1				
Anderson et al. 2020								*	
Back et al. 2008					*	*			
Bowden et al 2014 “in/near Sylvian fissure”									*2
Bowden et al 2014 “near ventricles”									*2
Bowden et al. 2014 “cerebellum”									*2
Bowden et al. 2015									*2
Bowden et al. 2017									*2
Burrow et al. 2014									*3
Chen, C.J et al. 2018									*4
Chen, C.J et al. 2019 “seizures”									*4
Chen, C.J et al. 2019 “micro vs GK”									*5
Chen, C.J et al. 2020									*4
Cheng C.H et al 2012									*5
Coffey et al. 1995	*								
Cohen-inbar et al. 2015									*5
Cohen-Inbar O. et al. 2017 “cerebellar”									*4
Cohen-Inbar O. et al. 2017 “early vs late”									*4
Da Costa et al. 2009							*		
Ding et al 2013 “eloquent locations”									*5
Ding et al 2014 “cerebellar”									*5
Ding et al. 2014 “Ruptured AVMS”									*5
Ding et al. 2015 “effect of prior haemorrhage on GK outcomes...”									*5
Ding et al. 2015 “temporal Lobe”									*5
Ding et al. 2016 “ARUBA eligible AVMs.”									*4
Ding et al. 2016 “repeat GK”									*7
Ding et al. 2017 “ARUBA Grade 1/2 AVMs”									*4
Ding et al. 2017 “Grade 3 AVMs”									*4

First author, year of publication	No access/Non-english/Not full paper	Study period pre- 1989	No original data or review	<20 patients / < 1 year FU	No reporting of demographic data (Age/ Nidus volume/ Dose)	No reporting of location/SM/ Presentation	No reporting of clinical outcomes of interest (Obliteration/ Haemorrhage/ RICs)	LINAC/ Cyberknife/ Repeat GK/ Multi-stage GKRS	Superseded by another study
Ding et al. 2017 “Unruptured AVMS”									*4
Ding et al. 2019 “Risk of... Hemorrhage”									*4
Douglas et al. 2008						*			
Duma et al. 1993	*								
El-Shehaby et al. 2019								*	
Flickinger et al. 1992							*		
Flickinger et al. 1997							*		
Flickinger et al. 1998							*		
Flickinger et al. 1999		*							
Flickinger et al. 2000							*		
Flickinger et al. 2002							*		
Franzin et al. 2016								*	
Friedman et al. 2003								*	
Graffeo et al. 2020									*3
Hanakita et al. 2014									*6
Hanakita et al. 2016									*6
Hasegawa et al. 2017									*6
Hasegawa et al. 2018 “a comprehensive study”							*		*6
Hasegawa et al. 2018 adv age”									*6
Hasegawa et al. 2020									*6
Hou et al. 1998	*								
Hung et al. 2020									*5
Ilyas et al. 2017				*					
Inoue. 2006						*			
Izawa et al. 2009			*						
Jevalkar et al. 2009				*					
Jokura et al. 2009						*			
Kano et al. 2012 “Large”								*	
Kano et al. 2017 “Estimating risks of ARE”							*		
Kano et al. 2017 “Repeat -GK”								*	
Karlsson et al. 1997		*							
Karlsson et al. 1999		*							
Karlsson et al. 2019					*				

First author, year of publication	No access/Non-english/Not full paper	Study period pre- 1989	No original data or review	<20 patients / < 1 year FU	No reporting of demographic data (Age/ Nidus volume/ Dose)	No reporting of location/SM/ Presentation	No reporting of clinical outcomes of interest (Obliteration/ Haemorrhage/ RICs)	LINAC/ Cyberknife/ Repeat GK/ Multi-stage GKRS	Superseded by another study
Kasliwal et al. 2008							*		
Kawashima et al. 2020									*6
Kemeny et al. 1989				*					
Kemeny et al. 2007					*				
Kihlstrom et al. 1997				*					
Kim H et al. 2010								*	
Kim M.J. et al. 2020							*		
Koga et al. 2010									*6
Koga et al. 2012									*6
Koltz et al. 2013					*				
Kurita et al. 2000 “occipital”									*6
Kurita et al. 2000 “brainstem”									
Lang et al.2018									
Lenck et al. 2018								*	
Lunsford et al. 1989									*2
Lunsford et al. 1990	*								
Lunsford et al. 1992	*								
Marciscano A.E. et al. 2017			*						
Maruyama et al. 2004									*2
Maruyama et al. 2005									*6
Maruyama et al. 2005 “corpus Callosum”									*6
Nagy et al. 2012 “deep”		*							
Nagy et al. 2012 “large”		*							
Nagy et al. 2017								*	
Nerva et al. 2015					*				
Nicolato et al. 2006 ⁶ Part 1							*8		
Nicolato et al. 2006 ⁶ Part 2							*8		
Niranjan et al. 2018									*2
Park et al. 2016								*	
Patibandla M.R. et al. 2018									*4
Patibandla M.R. et al. 2019									*4
Paul et al. 2014							*		
Pollock et al. 1994	*								
Pollock et al. 1996 “factors that predict”							*		
Pollock et al. 1996 “haemorrhage risk”									*2

First author, year of publication	No access/Non-english/Not full paper	Study period pre- 1989	No original data or review	<20 patients / < 1 year FU	No reporting of demographic data (Age/ Nidus volume/ Dose)	No reporting of location/SM/ Presentation	No reporting of clinical outcomes of interest (Obliteration/ Haemorrhage/ RICs)	LINAC/ Cyberknife/ Repeat GK/ Multi-stage GKRS	Superseded by another study
Pollock et al. 1996 “post-geniculate”							*		
Pollock et al. 1998									*3
Pollock et al. 1999					*				
Pollock et al. 2003									*3
Pollock et al. 2004									*3
Pollock et al. 2013									*3
Pollock et al. 2017								*	
Pomeraniec et al. 2018									*5
Potts M.B. 2014							*		
Safain M.G. et al. 2014				*					
Sasaki et al. 1998		*							
Schwyzer et al. 2012									*5
Serizawa et al. 2012	*								
Seymour et al. 2020								*	
Shi et al. 2007	*								
Shin et al. 2004									*6
Sirin et al. 2006									*2
Starke et al. 2013									*5
Starke et al. 2017									*4
Steiner et al. 1992		*							
Sun et al. 2011						*			
Sung et al. 2009								*	
Tonetti et al. 2018					*				
Wegner et al. 2011						*			
Yamamoto et al. 1992		*							
Yamamoto et al. 1992		*							
Yamamoto et al. 1995									*3
Yamamoto et al. 1996		*							
Yamamoto et al. 1998		*							
Yamamoto et al. 2012								*	
Yamamoto et al. 2013		*							
Yang et al. 2012						*			
Yen C.P et al. 2010								*	
Yen C.P et al. 2013			*						
Yen C.P et al. 2014									*5
Total number of studies:	8	12	3	5	8	7	16	15	57

¹This study reported on the outcomes following multimodal management for SM III AVMs. However, it was not possible to extract demographic data (Age/Margin dose/Median Nidus volume) specifically for those patients treated with Gamma Knife. ² Superseded by Kano et al 2012 [41, 43-45] ³Superseded by Pollock *et al*, 2016 [64] ⁴Superseded by Chen, C.J et al, 2018 [7] ⁵Superseded by Ding et al. 2014 [14-16] ⁶ Superseded by Hasegawa et al. 2018 [32] ⁷ Superseded by Yen C.P *et al* 2011 [73]. ⁸Nicolato et al. Part 1 and 2, 2006 were both excluded following senior discussion and review as both papers in combination do meet minimum outcomes dataset for inclusion, and it was not possible to assume that both studies were referring to the exact same patient set. The corresponding author was contacted via email for further data, however, a response is still pending at time of article submission.

APPENDIX 4. Overview of overlapping studies

Institution	First author and year of publication	Treatment Period	Number of patients	Median Follow-up (Months)	Included/ excluded with reason for exclusion
University of Virginia	Ding <i>et al</i> 2014 (SM 1/2)	1989-2012	502 patients SM1/2	Clinical: 61.6 (6.8–239.4)	Included.
	Ding <i>et al</i> 2014 (SM 3)	1989-2009	398 patients SM3	Clinical: 67.5 (6.2–239.2)	Included.
	Ding <i>et al</i> 2014 (SM 4/5)	1989-2009	110 patients SM4/5	Clinical: 97.4 (6.5– 312.9)	Included.
	Yen C.P <i>et al</i> 2009 Repeat GK cohort	1989-2007	140 patients	Mean Clinical: 84.2 (15-220)	Included.
					Excluded.
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2015 “effect of prior haemorrhage on GK outcomes...”	1989-2009	270 patients All Ruptured cohort	Mean Clinical: 85.7	Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
					Excluded.
					Reason: Longer study time period 1989-2013 however fewer (case matched) patients at 84 compared to Yen C.P et al 2009;
	Ding et al. 2016 “repeat GK”	1989-2013	84 patients Repeat GK cohort	Mean: 77.6 (±SD 47.6)	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5 which stratifies by SM grade
	Starke <i>et al.</i> 2013 A practical grading...	1989-2009	1012 patients	Mean: 96 (24–240)	Excluded.
					Reason: Data split according to cyst formation and Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5 stratifies by SM grade
	Pomeraniec et al. 2018	1989-2015	1159 patients	Mean: 72.1	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Cohen-inbar <i>et al.</i> 2015 “A quantitative analysis of ..”	1987-2012	105 patients	Mean Clinical: 53.8	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Hung <i>et al.</i> 2020 “pre-embolisation vs GK-only”	1989-2012	35 patients GK alone cohort	Angiography: 65 (13–48)	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Chen, C.J <i>et al.</i> 2019 Microsurgery vs GK	2001-2013	59 patients GK alone cohort	Mean Clinical: 92.1 (±SD 58.3)	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5. Not possible to extract data for all patients.
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 Ruptured AVMS	1989-2009	465 patients All Ruptured cohort	Mean Clinical: 72.2 (6.2– 312.9)	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Yen C.P <i>et al</i> 2014	1989-2009	31 patients All Incidental findings	Clinical: 51(24-196)	Excluded.
					Reason: superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Schwyzler <i>et al.</i> 2012	1989-2008	729 patients GK alone cohort	Mean Clinical: 79.2 (6-324)	Excluded.
					Reason: Only Basal Ganglia and Thalamus located AVMS Superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Cheng C.H <i>et al</i> 2012 “BG and Thalamus”	1989-2007	182 patients Basal ganglia and thalamus	Clinical: 85.8 (24-266)	

Institution	First author and year of publication	Treatment Period	Number of patients	Median Follow-up (Months)	Included/ excluded with reason for exclusion
University of Pittsburgh					Excluded.
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2015 “temporal Lobe”	1989-2012	175 patients Temporal lobe	Clinical 73.3 (6.2–230.4)	Reason: Only Temporal located AVMs Superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Ding <i>et al</i> 2014 “cerebellar”	1989-2010	60 patients Cerebellar	Clinical: 52.8months (6.8 to 195.4)	Reason: Only Cerebellar located AVMs superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Ding <i>et al</i> 2013 “eloquent locations”	1989-2009	134 patients Eloquent	79.8 (8.4 to 223.5)	Reason: Only eloquent area located AVMs superseded by Ding et al. 2014 SM1-2/3/4-5
	Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 (SM1/2)	1987-2006	217 patients SM1/2	64 (6–267)	Included.
	Kano <i>et al</i> 2014 (Grade 3)	1987-2009	474 patients SM3	89 (2–278)	Included.
	Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 Part 4 (BG and thalamus)	1987-2006	140 patients Basal Ganglia or Thalamus	Mean Clinical 81(2–265)	Included.
	Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 Part 5 (brainstem)	1987-2006	67 patients Brainstem	73.3 months (6–269)	Included.
	Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 Part 3 (repeat)	1987-2006	105 patients Repeat-GK	80 (6–205)	Included.
	Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 Part 6 (large multistage)	1987-2006	47 patients Large 10cm3+	87 (0.4–206)	Included.
	Bowden <i>et al</i> 2014 “in/near Sylvian fissure”	1987-2009	87 patients In/Near Sylvian fissure	59 (6–295)	Excluded. Reason: Only AVMs located in/near Sylvian fissure Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Bowden <i>et al</i> 2015 “post-geniculate pathway”	1987-2009	171 patients Along course of optic radiation	74 (5–297)	Excluded. Reason: Only AVMs located along optic radiation Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Bowden <i>et al.</i> 2014 “cerebellum”	1987-2007	64 patients Cerebellum	Radiological 73 (4–255)	Excluded. Reason: Only Cerebellar located AVMs Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Bowden <i>et al</i> 2014 “near ventricles”	1987-2009	188 patients Within or in contact ventricles	Radiological 65 (2–265)	Excluded. Reason: Only AVMs located in/near ventricles Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Maruyama <i>et al</i> 2004 “brainstem”	1987-2002	50 patients Brainstem	56 (5-176)	Excluded. Reason: Only Brainstem located AVMs Superseded by Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 Part 5 (brainstem)
	Niranjan <i>et al</i> 2018 “seizure presentation”	1987-2012	28 patients Large volume-staged	59 (6–295)	Excluded. Reason: Only AVMs with seizure presentation Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> large (include reference numbers)

Institution	First author and year of publication	Treatment Period	Number of patients	Median Follow-up (Months)	Included/ excluded with reason for exclusion
Mayo Clinic Rochester, USA					Excluded.
	Bowden <i>et al</i> 2017 “impact on headaches”	1995-2013	102 patients	89.7 (13-249)	Reason: Only AVMs with headache presentation Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Pollock <i>et al.</i> 1996 haemorrhage risk...	1987-1992	315 patients	Mean: 47	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Sirin <i>et al</i> 2006 Large	1987-2004	28 patients Large volume-staged	50 (3–15)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Kano <i>et al</i> 2012 Part 6 (large multistage)
	Lunsford <i>et al.</i> 1989	1987-1989	113 AVM cohort	not stated “minimum 6 months”	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Kano <i>et al.</i> (include reference numbers)
	Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 “The effect of treatment periods...”	1990-2009	371 patients (1990-1999 + 1999-2009 cohort)	93 (3-290)	Included
	Pollock <i>et al</i> 2017 “volume staged” large	1997-2012	34 patients Large Volume-staged	98.4 (36-159.6)	Included
					Excluded.
					Reason: Fewer case numbers and so superseded by Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 (include reference numbers)
	Grafteo <i>et al.</i> 2020	1990-2011	173 patients SM1/2	68 (24-275)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 (include reference numbers)
	Pollock <i>et al</i> 2003 patient outcomes after...	1990-1997	144 patients	Mean: 86 (23–169)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 (include reference numbers)
	Pollock <i>et al</i> 2013 risk of stroke...	1990-2005	174 patients	64 (IQR 36–120)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 (include reference numbers)
	Pollock <i>et al</i> 2004 “BG thalamus, and BS”	1990-2000	56 patients Deep located AVMs	45 (12–121)	Excluded.
					Reason: No overlap 1987-1990 however fewer patients (220) compared to Pollock <i>et al.</i> 2016 (371)
	Pollock <i>et al.</i> 1998 “factors associated”	1987-1992	220 patients	mean: 47 (±SD 20)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 (include reference numbers)
	Yamamoto <i>et al</i> 1995	1990-1993	121 patients	97 (54-205)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Pollock <i>et al</i> 2016 (include reference numbers)
	Burrow <i>et al</i> 2014	1990-2009	80 patients	Mean: 68 (12-133)	

Institution	First author and year of publication	Treatment Period	Number of patients	Median Follow-up (Months)	Included/ excluded with reason for exclusion
University of Tokyo Hospital	Hasegawa et al. 2018 “Comparison of the long term..”	1990-2014	592 Patients	92 (1–320)	Included.
					Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 which includes ARUBA eligible cohort.
	Hanakita <i>et al.</i> 2016 ARUBA eligible	1990-2010	292 Patients ARUBA-eligible	62 (IQR 36–106)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 which includes large AVMs
	Hanakita <i>et al.</i> 2014	1998-2010	67 patients Large (10cm3+)	55 (7-178)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 (include reference number)
	Maruyama <i>et al.</i> 2005	1990-2003	500 patients	93.6 (IQR 115.2)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Shin <i>et al.</i> 2004	1990-1999	408 patients	65 (1-135)	Excluded.
					Reason: Only ruptured AVMs Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Kawashima <i>et al.</i> 2020 “Ruptured AVMs”	1990-2016	410 patients All Ruptured cohort	111 (1–351)	Excluded.
					Reason: Only Occipital lobe located AVMs Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Kurita <i>et al</i> 2000 “occipital”	1990-1997	37 patients Occipital lobe	46 12-103	Excluded.
					Reason: Only brainstem located AVMs Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Kurita <i>et al</i> 2000 “brainstem”	1990-1997	30 patients Brainstem	Mean: 52.2 (±SD 31.3)	Excluded.
					Reason: Only cerebellar located AVMs Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2017 “cerebellar”	1990-2010	45 patients Cerebellum	120 (5-291)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 which excludes paediatric patients.
	Hasegawa et al. 2020 “re-evaluating”	1990-2014	791 patients (Adults+Paediatrics)	83 (1-320)	Excluded.
					Reason: No data on RICs
	Hasegawa et al. 2018 “a comprehensive study”	1990-2010	581 patients	121.2 (24-320.4)	Excluded.
					Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Hasegawa et al. 2018 adv age”	1990-2013	561 Patients Age 65 years + versus 65-	91	Excluded.
					Reason: Only corpus callosum located AVMs Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Maruyama <i>et al</i> 2005“corpus Callosum”	1990-2002	32 patients Corpus Callosum	108 (12-144)	

Institution	First author and year of publication	Treatment Period	Number of patients	Median Follow-up (Months)	Included/ excluded with reason for exclusion
Multi-Center (International Gamma Knife Research Foundation): USA: University of Virginia, University of Pittsburgh, University of Louisville, Cleveland Clinic Foundation, New York University, Beaumont Health System, Michigan Canada: University of Sherbrooke, Quebec. Puerto Rico: University of Puerto Rico, San Juan.	Koga <i>et al</i> 2010 “SRS thalamus”	1990-2009	48 patients Thalamus	45 (6-198)	Excluded. Reason: Only Thalamus located AVMs Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Koga <i>et al.</i> 2012 “tractography”	Not Stated (“from 2000”)	52 patients Diffusion Tensor Tractography treatment planning cohort	48 (36-80)	Excluded. Reason: Superseded by Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 which includes DTT cohort
	Chen, C.J <i>et al.</i> 2018 (paediatric vs adult AVM)	1987-2014	1845 patients Adults	Mean: 80.7 (±SD 62.5)	Included.
	Seymour <i>et al.</i> 2020 “volume staged GK IGKRF”	1991-2016	257 patients Two-stage+	69.5 (1.68-302.4)	Included.
	Starke <i>et al.</i> 2017	1988-2013	2236 patients Adult+Paediatrics	Mean: 84 (6-240)	Excluded. Reason: Unlike Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018 does not split data (same) into adult:Paediatric
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2019 “Risk of... Hemorrhage”	1987-2014	2320 patients	Mean: 80.36 (±SD 62.4)	Excluded. Reason: No data on RICs which were included in Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Patibandla <i>et al.</i> 2019 “→ outcomes pre/post-2000”	2001–2014	664 patients	Mean: 45.0 ± 29.6	Excluded. Reason: Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018 which includes 1987-2000 data
	Chen, C.J <i>et al.</i> 2018 “Advanced age...”	1987-2014	1845 patients Adults	Mean: 80.7 (±SD 62.5)	Excluded. Reason: Same dataset as Chen C.J <i>et al.</i> 2018 but splits data into age 65 +/-
	Chen, C.J <i>et al.</i> 2020 “Basal ganglia and thalamus”	1987-2014	363 patients Basal Ganglia or Thalamus	Mean: 86.5	Excluded. Reason: Same data as Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018 but only includes patients with Basal ganglia or Thalamus located AVMs
	Chen, C.J <i>et al.</i> 2019 “seizures”	1987-2014	419 patients	Mean: 37.2 (±SD 16)	Excluded. Reason: Unlike Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018 does not split data (same) into adult:Paediatric
	Cohen-Inbar <i>et al.</i> 2017	1988-2014	1398 patients All obliterated		Excluded. Reason: Outcome data only on patients who had proven obliteration
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2017 ARUBA-eligible Grade 1/2 AVMs	1987-2014.	232 patients SM1/2	Mean: 90.5 (12.0-324.7)	Excluded. Reason: Only SM1/2 ARUBA-eligible AVMs Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018

Institution	First author and year of publication	Treatment Period	Number of patients	Median Follow-up (Months)	Included/ excluded with reason for exclusion
					Excluded.
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2017 Grade 3 AVMs	1987-2014	891 patients SM3	Mean: 88.6 (12.0 to 278.4)	Reason: Only SM3 ARUBA-eligible AVMs Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2016 ARUBA eligible AVMs.	1987-2014.	509 patients ARUBA-eligible	Mean: 86.2 (±SD 62.3)	Reason: Only ARUBA-eligible AVMs Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Ding <i>et al.</i> 2017 Unruptured AVMs	Not stated	938 patients All Unruptured	70.9 (12.0-275.6)	Reason: Only unruptured AVMs Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018
	Patibandla M.R. <i>et al.</i> 2018 Grade 4/5	Not stated	233 patients (SM4/5)	84.5 (±SD 59.5)	Reason: Only SM4/5 AVMs Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018
					Excluded.
	Cohen-Inbar O. <i>et al.</i> 2017	1988-2015	162 patients Cerebellar	Median 60 (7–325)	Reason: Only Cerebellar AVMs Superseded by Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018
^a Median clinical or radiological follow-up, whichever is longer. ^b ARUBA (A Randomised trial of Unruptured Brain Arteriovenous malformation).					

APPENDIX 5. Risk of bias Summary ROBINS-I

First author, year of publication	Bias due to confounding	Bias in selection of participants into the study, selection bias	Bias in classification of interventions	Bias due to deviation from intended interventions, performance bias	Bias due to missing data, <80%, attrition bias	Bias in measurement of outcomes, detection bias	Bias in selection of the reported result, outcome reporting bias
Arslan <i>et al.</i> 2017 [2]							
Bir <i>et al.</i> 2015 [4]							
Bose <i>et al.</i> 2015 [5]							
Chang <i>et al.</i> 2000 [6]							
Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018 [7]							
Choe <i>et al.</i> 2008 [8]					a		
Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 [14]							
Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 [15]							
Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 [16]							
Ditty <i>et al.</i> 2017 [18]							
Franzin <i>et al.</i> 2013 [24]							
Han <i>et al.</i> 2008 [31]							
Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 [32]							
Hirschmann <i>et al.</i> 2019 [35]							
Hu <i>et al.</i> 2020 [36]							
Izawa <i>et al.</i> 2005 [39]							
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2014 [41]							
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2012 [43]							
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2012 [44]							
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2012 [45]							
Kim BS <i>et al.</i> 2019 [46]							
Kiran <i>et al.</i> 2009 [47]							
Liscak <i>et al.</i> 2007 [49]							
Matsunaga et Shuto. 2014 [51]							
Missios <i>et al.</i> 2014 [52]							
Nicolato et al. 2002 [54]							
Orio <i>et al.</i> 2006 [56]							
Pan <i>et al.</i> 2000 [57]							
Parkhutik <i>et al.</i> 2013 [58]							
Pollock <i>et al.</i> 2016 [64]							
Raboud <i>et al.</i> 2018 [65]							
Tuleasca <i>et al.</i> 2020 [71]							
Zeiler <i>et al.</i> 2011 [74]							
Zhao <i>et al.</i> 2008 [75]							

Green indicates low risk of bias; yellow indicates moderate risk of bias; red indicates serious risk of bias; grey indicates no information on which to base a judgement about risk of bias for this domain ^aChoe et al. 2008 [8] has missing radiological follow-up data (MRI) for 24 patients (/100) affecting obliteration & RICs data which has been attributed to ‘*incomplete short term follow up*’ and additionally, ‘*a signif[i]cant proportion of lost patients before reaching final outcome*’. ^b Raboud et al. 2018 [65] is the single prospective study of all included studies (which are retrospective).

APPENDIX 6. Detailed characteristics of included studies

Study, year of publication	Total number of patients	Female patients (%)	Median age (range/SD)	Location ^a (%)	Resected Location (%)	NI grade (%)	Venous Drainage (%)	Median Maximum Volume Drainage ^b (range)	Associated at flow-related or intervalial aneurysm (%)	Median RRAS OR VRAS Score	Pre-CKRS resection rate (%)	Present rate with Hemorrhage (%)	Present rate with seizure (%)	Asymptomatic presentation (%)	Median Nidus Volume (range)	Median Prescriptio as dose G ₂ (Range)	Median Duration of follow-up (range/SD)	Number of patients with follow-up	Complete Obliteration rate – Angiography-confirmed (%)	Complete Obliteration rate – Angiography or MRI confirmed (%)	Median Time to obliteration (months)	Method of determination of obliteration as a.s. patients underwent imaging modality	Post-CKRS Hemorrhage (%)	Post-CKRS transient RBC (radiological or symptom rate)	Post-CKRS permanent RBC (radiological or FND)	Post-CKRS new onset frequency seizures	Cyst formation (%)	Post-CKRS Mortality (%)	Patients who underwent repeat-CKRS (%)	Outcomes for repeat-CKRS cohort		
Arslan <i>et al.</i> 2017 [2]	199	89 (45%)	32 (3–34)	Lobar: 150 (75.4) Deep: 35 (17.6) Basal ganglia: 10 (5) Thalamus: 10 (5) Brainstem: 15 (8) Corpus callosum: 5 (3) Cerebellar: 5 (5%)	—	1.6 (0.86) II 45 (22.6) III 119 (59.8) IV 14 (7.04) V 5 (2.51)	—	—	7 (3.51)	1.07 (0.18–4.80)	—	86 (43)	42 (21)	1 (0.5)	2.50 (0.05–9)	22 (10.26 G ₂)	60.2 (7–100.1)	199	—	141 (70.71)	—	MRI AND Angiography: MRI rate: 46 (23%)	7 (3.5%)	Total 54 (27%) including symptomatic in 13 (6.5%)	0 (0)	7 (3.5)	—	4 (1.5), 3/4 ICH 1/4 Unrelated	29 (14.6)	10/29 obliteration		
Bir <i>et al.</i> 2015 [4]	85	42 (49.5)	41 (37.70)	Cerebral: 68 (80) Deep: 9 (10.6) Thalamus: 4.85 Brain stem: 3.85 Basal ganglia: 2.85 Cerebellum: 9 (10.6) Corpus callosum: 2.85 (2.35)	—	1.8 (9.41%) II 29 (34.1) III 25 (29.4%) IV 21 (24.7%) V 2 (2.4%)	—	—	3 (0.4–9.5)	—	—	Embolisation 8 (9.4%)	26 (30.5)	—	3 (0.4–9.5)	Mean: 18 (14–25)	32.65 (6–133)	85	67.85 (79)	31 (35.89)	—	MRI AND Angiography: MRI rate: 100	2 (5.3%) annual rate 1.6%	0 (0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	1 (1.2)	Total: 3 (3.56), 2/3 ICH 1/3 Hydrocephalus	17 (20)	—		
Bose <i>et al.</i> 2015 [5]	96	34 (35.42)	Mean: 27.52 (±SD: 14.48)	—	—	1.9 (9.38) II 31 (32.29) III 44 (45.83) IV 11 (11.46) V 1 (1.04)	—	—	—	—	—	Embolisation 21 (22.90) Surgical resection: 4 (4.1)	57 (59.4)	0 (0)	—	Mean: 7.45 (1.07–12.12)	Mean: 24.6 (15–32)	96	39 (72.2)	—	—	Angiography: 50	10 (10.42%)	Total transient or permanent symptomatic: 25 (26.04%)	Total transient or permanent symptomatic: 25 (26.04%)	—	—	Total: 2 (2.08%), ICH 2/2	—	—		
Chang <i>et al.</i> 2000 [6]	278	117 (42)	Mean: 27.52 (±SD: 14.48)	Lobar: 156 (56.13%) Deep: 62 (22.29%) Corpus callosum: 13 (5%) Cerebellum: 23 (8.3%) Cerebrum: fluid pathology: 20 (7.2%)	—	1.37 (14.1%) II 84 (30.2%) III 84 (30.2%) IV 50 (18.3%) V 31 (11.2%)	Deep: 155 (55.76) Superficial: 10 (3.6%)	2.56	63 (26.3)	—	—	Embolisation 72 (25.9%) Surgical resection: 20 (7.2) GK: 2 (0.73%)	179 (64.6)	61 (21.9)	7 (2.5)	12.1 (0.15–109.5)	mean: 16.2 (6.4–30)	24.7 (0.4–90.2)	128 with radiological FU	1/28 with 2 year follow-up: 101 (78.9%) 101/128 (78.9%) 101/128 (78.9%)	1/28 with 2 year follow-up: 101 (78.9%) 101/128 (78.9%)	—	Angiography	19 (6.8%)	symptomatic 64 (48%)	symptomatic 10 (100%)	8 (2.9)	1 (0.4)	—	23 (9.1)	—	
Chen <i>et al.</i> 2018 [7]	1845	929 (50.4%)	40.4 (±SD: 14.1)	Deep: 184 (10.0%)	1202 (70%)	1.209 (11.2%) II 699 (17.7%) III 751 (18.7%) IV 168 (4.8%) V 18 (1%)	Deep: 1053 (57.1%) Superficial: 81 (4.4%) EBT: 138 (7.5%)	Mean: 2.4 (±SD: 1.2)	220 (18%) (12.4%)	Mean: 1.4 (±SD: 0.6)	—	Embolisation 387 (21.5%) Surgical resection: 80 (4.4%) EBT: 138 (7.5%)	999 (54.2)	—	—	MEAN: 4.6 (±SD: 3.3)	Mean: 20.4 (±SD: 1.8)	Mean: 30.7 (±SD: 18.3)	1845	890 (48.8%)	1147 (62.2%)	—	Angiography and MRI	147 (8%)	Total: 345 (29%) including symptomatic 130 (7.6%)	symptomatic 45 (2.8%)	—	—	Total: 96 (7%) all cases	—	—	
Choe <i>et al.</i> 2008 [8]	100	48 (48)	Mean: 34 (±SD: 14.6)	Cerebral: 67 (67) Deep: 18 (18) Age: 18–28 (18.8%)	—	1.1 (18.5%) II 27 (27) III 36 (36) IV 11 (11) V 8 (8)	—	—	—	—	—	Embolisation 34 (34)	25 (25)	8 (8)	mean: 4.301 (±SD: 2.93)	20.8 (13–32)	Mean: 37.5 (±SD: 15.4)	100	28.48 (38)	—	Mean: 25.3 (±SD: 43)	Angiography: 48 patients	7 (7%) Annual rate 1.2%	Total: 76 (76%) patients with 2 years FU: 11 (11%) Total: 24 (24%) including symptomatic 11 (11%)	0 (0)	—	—	Total: 1 (1) ICH	16 (16)	—		
Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 [14]	110	53 (48.2%)	27.6 (±SD: 14.1) Age: 18–28 (25.5%)	Superficial: 62 (56.4%) Deep: 18 (16.4%)	110 (100%)	IV 109 (99.1%) V 1 (0.9%)	Deep: 110 (100)	3.4	—	1.18 (0.47–4.10)	—	Embolisation 32 (29.1%) Surgical resection: 16 (14.5%)	56 (50.9)	23 (23)	4 (3.6)	5.7 (1.2–33.0)	19 (10–25)	Clinical: 97.4 (8.2–29.2) Radiological: 87.8 (7.3–261.6)	37/110 (33.6)	48/110 (43.64) Actuarial obliteration rate at 3 years were 100% and 5 years were 100%	—	Angiography and MRI	20 (18.2%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (1897 risk-years)	Total: 49 (48.0%) including symptomatic 10 (9.1%)	symptomatic 3 (2.73%)	1 (1.3)	—	—	34 (30.9)	—		
Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 [15]	398	194 (48.7)	30.9 (±SD: 14.1) Age: 18–28 (18.8%)	Superficial: 214 (53.8%) Deep: 184 (46.2%)	363 (91.2)	III 398 (100%)	Deep: 337 (92.7%) Multiple: 169 (46.2%)	2.3 (0.4–5.5)	—	1.18 (0.21–3.70)	—	Embolisation 234 (58.8%) Surgical resection: 44 (11.3%)	80 (20.1)	11 (2.8)	2.8 (0.1–27.8)	20 (5–32)	Clinical: 67.5 (8.2–29.2) Radiological: 230.4	222/398 (58.8)	276/398 (69.3%) Actuarial obliteration rate: 3 and 5 years: 39% and 60%	—	45.5 months	Angiography and MRI	24 (7.0%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (1897 risk-years)	Total: 134 (33.2%) follow-up: 115 (34.3%) including symptomatic 21 (5.04%)	symptomatic 3 (2.3%)	7 (1.8)	—	Total: Two (0.5), 2/2 ICH	64 (16.1)	—		
Ding <i>et al.</i> 2014 [16]	502	249 (49.6%)	35.2 (±SD: 14.1) Age: 18–28 (15.7%)	Superficial: 470 (93.6%) Deep: 12 (2.4%)	204 (40.0%)	1147 (29.2%) II 355 (70.7%) III 391 (77.9%)	Deep: 111 (22.1%) Superficial: 391 (77.9%)	2 (0.2–4.5)	—	1.03 (0.21–2.95)	—	Embolisation: 101 (20.1%) Surgical resection: 35 (11.6%)	235 (46.8)	126 (25.1)	15 (3.0)	2.4 (0.1–22.5)	23 (7–36)	Clinical: 61.6 (8.8–239.4) Radiological: 479 (5.7–239.4)	304/502 (60.6)	382/502 (76.1%) Actuarial obliteration rate: 3.5/5/10 years were 41.06/53.08%	—	Angiography and MRI	28 (5.6%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.4% (1518 risk-years)	Total: 414 patients with 2 years FU: 10 (2.4%) including symptomatic 10 (2.4%)	Total: 414 patients with 2 years FU: 10 (2.4%) including symptomatic 10 (2.4%)	15 (3.6)	6 (1.2)	—	50 (10.0)	—		
Doty <i>et al.</i> 2017 [18]	78	39 (50)	Mean: 38.5 (±SD: 14.3) years	Cerebral: 69 (89.7%) Deep: 6 (7.8) Basal ganglia: 4 (5.1) Thalamus: 1 (1.3%) Brainstem: 1 (1.3%) Ventricular: 2 (2.6)	—	1.5 (6.5%) II 14 (18.2%) III 36 (46.1%) IV 17 (22.2%) V 1 (1.3%)	—	—	—	—	—	Embolisation 9 (11.5%) Surgical resection: 5 (6.4%)	9 (14.3)	78 (100)	—	17.5 (17–22 G ₂)	Mean: 36.4 (1–242.6)	78	—	59 who underwent MRI or CTA or DSA: 34/59 (57.6%)	MRI or CTA or DSA: 59 (75.6%)	6 (7.69%)	symptomatic transient or permanent: 6 (7.69%)	Radiation necrosis: 3 (3.85%)	5 (3)	—	—	10 (12.8)	—			
Fransen <i>et al.</i> 2013 [24]	127	56 (44.1)	38.5 (6–76)	Lobar: 106 (83.5%) Deep: 21 (16.5%)	80 (63%)	1.21 (16.2%) II 14 (18.2%) III 36 (46.1%) IV 17 (22.2%) V 1 (1.3%)	Deep: 70 (55.1%) Superficial: 27 (44.9%)	1.8	—	1.08 (0.47–2.26)	—	Embolisation 21 (16.5%) Surgical resection: 7 (5.5%) Radiosurgery: 5 (3.9%) Embolisation + RS: 6 (4.7%) Embolisation + Surgery: 3 (2.4%) Embolisation + surgery + RS: 1 (0.8)	55 (43.3)	40 (31.5)	28 (22)	2.74 (0.1–13)	22 (16.6) 30	Min: 36	104 radiological FU	90 who underwent angiography: 54 (60)	104 with MRI follow-up: 72 (69.2)	44 (43.3–53.1)	DSA: 90 MRI: 104	11 (8.66%) Annual bleeding rate: 2.1%	—	8 (6.3%) permanent FND and 6 (4.8%) radiation necrosis	15 (12.3)	2 (1.6)	Total: 5 (4.1), 5/5 ICH	—	—	
Han <i>et al.</i> 2008 [31]	218	73 (33.49)	Mean: 33 (±SD: 15)	Peripheral: 151 (69.3%) Deep: 50 (22.9%) Cerebellum: 17 (7.8%)	—	1.54 (24.8) II 151 (69.3%) III 68 (31.2%) IV 15 (6.9%) V 2 (0.9%)	—	—	20 (9.2)	—	—	Embolisation 21 (14.7%) Surgical resection: 15 (8.7%) Evaluation of ICH from AVM and Aneurysm: occlusion: 33 (15.1)	106 (48.6)	58 (26.6)	15 (6.9)	3.4 (0.1–35.2)	18.0 (10.0–28.0)	Mean: 44 (±SD: 20)	218	Min: 2 year follow-up: 119 (74) (66.4) 2 year follow-up: 72 (33) total 79 (36) who had permanent neurological deficits and 7 of the patients improved completely within 2 years	Min: 2 year follow-up: 111 (50.9) 183 (71.6) (83.1) 2 year follow-up: 72 (33) total 79 (36) who had permanent neurological deficits and 7 of the patients improved completely within 2 years	24	Angiography: 19 MRI: 183	12 (5.9%) Annual bleeding rate: 1.9% (1897 risk-years)	Total: 137 (62.8%) including symptomatic 13 (6%)	symptomatic 13 (6%)	8 (3.7%)	—	0 (0)	Total: 4 (1.83), 1/4 ICH 3/4 Unrelated	24 (11)	—
Hasegawa <i>et al.</i> 2018 [32]	592	248 (42%)	38 (20–80)	Deep: location: 217 (37)	338 (57)	I–II 328 (55%)	Deep: 308 (52) Superficial: 284 (48.0)	2.2 (0.5–6)	—	—	—	Embolisation 61 (11%) Surgical resection: 52 (9%)	311 (53)	—	—	2.7 (0.1–44.5)	20 (15–28)	92 (1–320)	592	391 (66)	391 (66)	—	Angiography: DSA	386.6% Annual hemorrhage rate at 2.5/5/10 years were 2.5/3.6/5.8%	Permanent symptomatic at 2.5/10/15 years of 16.4%	—	356 (59) including transient hematomas	—	37	—		
Hirschmann <i>et al.</i> 2019 [35]	265	124 (47%)	40 (7–80)	—	144 (54%)	Spectroscopic: 109 (41%) II 109 (41%) C 26 (10%)	Deep: 165 (62%) Superficial: 100 (38%)	—	1.3 (0.2–4.2)	—	—	Embolisation 15 (5.7%) Surgical resection: 8 (3.0%) Repeat: 16 (6.0%)	81 (31)	—	2.3 (0.1–42.0)	19 (13–22)	66 (72–384)	265	—	Actuarial obliteration rate at 3.5/10 years were 21.6/70%	—	Angiography and MRI	24 (9.0%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.2%	Total: 285 (107%) including symptomatic 13 (4.6%)	—	—	no transient RBC column	Total: 7 (2.5) ICH 1/1 Unrelated	49 (18.9)	—		
Hu <i>et al.</i> 2020 [36]	98	38 (38.8)	37 (4–80)	Lobar: 81 (82.7%) Deep: 17 (17.3%) Basal ganglia: 2 (2.0%) Brainstem: 1 (1.0%) Cerebellum: 8 (8.2%)	61 (62.2)	1.17 (17.35) II 13 (13.7%) III 33 (33.7%) IV 14 (14.29%) V 1 (1.02)	Deep: 57 (58.2%) Superficial: 41 (41.8)	2.58	25 (25.5)	—	0 (0)	47 (48.0)	29 (29.6)	—	7.1 (0.1–42.6)	18 (16–21)	47.5 (3–93)	98	43 (96 (43.9))	63 (64.3)	31 (14.82)	Angiography: 45 (45.9%) MRI only: 30 (30.6%)	2 (2%)	Total: 62 (63.3%) including symptomatic 7 (7.1%)	—	—	—	—	—	—		
Izawa <i>et al.</i> 2005 [39]	237	93 (39.2%)	mean: 30.1 (6–74)	Lobar: 159 (67.1%) Deep: 65 (27.4%) Cerebellum: 13 (5.5%)	—	1.33 (13.9%) II 104 (44.3%) III 131 (55.7%)	—	—	—	—	—	Embolisation 130 (54.9%) Surgical resection: 20 (8.4%)	50 (21.1)	—	—	mean: 4.7 (0.1–28.5)	mean: 20.2 (12–26)	81.6 (24–150)	237	130 (54.9)	130 (54.9)	—	Angiography	8 (3.4%)	Total: 1 (0.4%) including symptomatic 0 (0)	—	4 (1.7)	8 (3.4)	Total: 3 (1.27%), 3/3 ICH	—	—	
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2014 [41]	474	222 (46.8)	33 (±SD: 13.2)	Cerebral: 240 (50.6%) Deep: 169 (35.7%) Thalamus: 64 (13.5%) Basal ganglia: 11 (2.3%) Brainstem: 36 (7.6%) Cerebellum: 8 (1.7%)	430 (90.7)	III 474 (100%)	Deep: 326 (68.8%) Superficial: 148 (31.2%)	1.9 (0.6–2.9)	32 (6.8)	—	—	Embolisation: 67 (14.1%) Surgical resection: 44 (9.3%) Embolisation + resection: 14 (3)	268 (56.5)	—	3.8 (0.1–26.3)	20 (13–25)	89 (2–278)	—	Actuarial obliteration: 3.4/5/10 years were 47%, 60%, 62%	Actuarial obliteration: 3.4/5/10 years were 47%, 60%, 62%	—	Angiography: 19 MRI only: 258	18 (3.8%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (1357 patient-years)	symptomatic 17 (3.58%)	—	—	9 (1.9)	Total: 21 (4.41) ICH 1/1 Unrelated	59 (12.4)	34/59 (59) obliteration		
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2014 [43]	133	63 (47.4)	26 (3–69)	Deep: 133 (100%) Basal ganglia: 56 (40%) Thalamus: 77 (55%)	—	II 11 (8.3%) III 40 (30.1%) IV 20 (15.0%) V 11 (8.3%)	—	2.0 (0.6–4.8)	7 (5%)	1.39 (±SD: 0.50)	—	Embolisation 113 (85) Surgical resection: 20 (15.0)	3 (2)	3 (2)	2.7 (0.1–20.7)	20 (15–25)	Clinical: 162 (60.5) Radiological: 41	—	Actuarial obliteration: 3.4/5/10 years were 47%, 60%, 62%	Actuarial obliteration: 3.4/5/10 years were 47%, 60%, 62%	—	Angiography: 19 MRI only: 78	15 (11%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (1357 patient-years)	symptomatic 11 (8.3%)	6 (4.5%) Ss	—	1 (0.8)	Total: 11 (8.3%) ICH 1/1 Unrelated	18 (13.5)	9/18 obliteration		
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2014 [44]	67	25 (37.3)	41 (6–79)	Deep: 67 (100%) Basal ganglia: 40 (59.7%) Thalamus: 12 (17.9%) Brainstem: 3 (4.5%)	67 (100)	III 7 (10.4%) IV 9 (13.4%) V 1 (1.5%)	—	—	7 (10.4)	1.42 (±SD: 0.55)	—	Embolisation 11 (16.4%)	51 (76)	0 (0)	4 (6)	1.4 (0.1–13.4)	20 (14–26)	73.3 months (6–269)	—	Actuarial obliteration: 3.4/5/10 years were 36%, 63%, 63%	Actuarial obliteration: 3.4/5/10 years were 36%, 63%, 63%	—	Angiography: 19 MRI only: 35	4 (6%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.9% (1357 patient-years)	Symptomatic: 4 (6%)	7 (10.4) Ss	—	2 (3.0)	Total: 10 (14.9), 4/10 hydrocephalus <5/10 unrelated	4/67 (6.0)	1/4 obliteration	
Kano <i>et al.</i> 2012 [45]	217	106 (49)	38 (3–77)	Cerebral: 174 (80.2%) Basal ganglia: 7 (3.2%) Thalamus: 1 (0.5%) Brainstem: 4 (1.8%) Cerebellum: 8 (3.7%) Corpus callosum: 10 (4.6%)	—	1.34 (16%) II 106 (49%)	—	1.9 (0.5–7.7)	21 (9.7)	1.12 (±SD: 0.52)	0 (0)	78 (36)	61 (28)	30 (14)	2.3 (0.1–14.1)	22 (15–27)	64 (6–267)	—	Actuarial obliteration rates: 3.4/5/10 years were 47%, 60%, 77%, and 83%	Actuarial obliteration rates: 3.4/5/10 years were 47%, 60%, 77%, and 83%	—	Angiography: 19 MRI only: 148	13 (6%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (1357 patient-years)	Total: 5 (2.3%) including symptomatic 5 (2.3%)	0 Permanent: 0 Radiation: 0	3 (1.4%) who experienced transient symptomatic RBCs	2 (0.9)	Total: 6 (2.8), 6/6 ICH	8 (3.7)	4/8 obliteration		
Kim BS <i>et al.</i> 2019 [46]	264	98 (37.1)	Mean: 40.7 (±SD: 12.26)	Supratentorial: 188 (71.2%) Deep: 7 (2.6%) Thalamus: 4 (1.5%) Basal ganglia: 1 (0.4%) Corpus callosum: 1 (0.4%) Cerebellum: 8 (3.0%) Brainstem: 3 (1.1%) Interventricular: 3 (1.1%)	121 (45.8)	I 12 (4.5%) II 152 (57.6%) III 87 (32.9%) IV 38 (14.4%) V 2 (0.8%)	Deep: 65 (24.6%) Superficial: 199 (75.4%)	3.6 (±SD: 1.6)	53 (20.1)	Mean: 1.35 (±SD: 0.34)	0 (0)	0 (0)	66 (25.0)	92 (34.8)	Mean: 4.8 (±SD: 3.3)	Mean: 21 (12–30)	Mean: 30.7 (±SD: 19.9)	264	115 (26.4 (43.5))	164 (62.1) Actuarial obliteration rate at 3.5/5/10 years: 37.1% 70.5/84.1/90.1	164 (62.1) Actuarial obliteration rate at 3.5/5/10 years: 37.1% 70.5/84.1/90.1	40.1 (95% CI: 37.0–43.5)	MRI alone: 40 (15.1%) DSA: 151 (56.8%)	19 (8.26%) Annual Rate: 2.83% (±SD: 0.44)	Total: 149 (56.4%) including symptomatic in 35 (13.3%)	symptomatic 11 (1.1%)	24 (9.1)	—	Total: 2 (0.76), 1/2 AVM-related cases, 1/2 unrelated	34 (12.9)	—	
Kim <i>et al.</i> 2009 [47]	53	12 (22.6)	Mean: 27.7 (±SD: 5.5)	Deep: 53 (100%) Basal ganglia: 47 (88.7%) Brainstem: 6 (11.3%)	53 (100)	I 0 (0%) II 40 (75.5%) III 40 (75.5%) IV 11 (21%) V 2 (4%)	—	—	—	—	—	Embolisation 43 (81)	8 (15)	—	Mean: 4.3 (0.1–36.0)	Mean: 23.3 (0.6–25)	Mean: 28 (12–36)	53	Min: 4 year angiography follow-up: 15 (28.3%) Actuarial obliteration rates: 3 and 4 years: 86 and 74%	—	—	Angiography: 19	5 (9.4%)	Symptomatic: 4 (7.54%)	symptomatic 4 (7.54%)	—	—	—	—	—	—	
Lesiak <i>et al.</i> 2007 [49]	330	152 (46.2%)	35 (3–78)	Lobar: 230 (69.7%) Deep: 42 (12.7%) Cerebellum: 18 (5.5%) Corpus callosum: 18 (5.5%)	—	1.39 (11.3%) II 115 (34.8%) III 100 (30.3%) IV 10 (3.0%) V 0 (0)	—	2.2 (0.6–6.1)	—	—	—	Embolisation 207 (63)	105 (31.82)	—	3.9 (0.15–28.6)	20 (8–32)	38 (1–118)	300	222/300 (74)	222/300 (74)	25 (12–96)	Angiography: 22	16/300 (5.33%)	—	8/300 (2.67%)	12/300 (4)	—	—	60/300 (20%)	47/68 (69)		

Study, year of publication	Total number of patients	Female patients (%)	Median age (range/SD)	Location ¹ (%)	Eloquent Location (%)	SM grade (%)	Venous Drainage (%)	Median Maximum an Nihilus Diameter, cm (range)	Associated d flow-related or intratumoral aneurysm (%)	Median RBAS OR YRAS Score	Pre-CRKS intervention on (%)	Presentat ion with Hemorrhage (%)	Presentat ion with seizure (%)	Asymptomatic presentat ion (%)	Median Nihilus Volume cm ³ (range)	Median Prescripti on dose Gy (Range)	Median Duration of follow-up months (range)	Number of patients with follow-up	Complete Obliteration rate—Angiography-confirmed (%)	Complete Obliteration rate—Angiography or MRI confirmed (%)	Median Time to obliteration on (months)	Method of determinat ion of obliteration or not, or patients underwent imaging modality	Post-CRKS Hemorrhage (%)	Post-CRKS transient RICH (radiological or symptomatically)	Post-CRKS permanent RICH (radiological or permanent on FND)	Post-CRKS new-onset increase frequency seizures	Cyst formation (%)	Post-CRKS Mortality (%)	Patients who underwent repeat CRKS (%)	Outcomes for repeat CRKS cohort	
Matsuura et al. 2014 [51]	82	28 (34.1)	mean 43.3 (±SD17.5)	Deep 27 (32.9) cerebellar vermis 20 (24.4) cerebellar hemispheres 35 (42.7)	60 (73.2)	134 (17.1%) II 37 (45.1%) III 30 (36.8) IV 1 (1.2%)	—	1.7 (0.4-5.5)	12 (14.6)	1.42 (0.58-3.22)	embolization 11 (13.4%) Surgical resection 5 (6.1%)	69 (84.1)	0 (0)	11 (13.4)	0.95 (0.03-22.9)	18 (12-25)	73.2 (60-219.6)	82	41 (50)	65 (79.3) Actual rate at 35 years is 58.5% and 78%	26.4 (6-63.6)	Angiography 41 MRI 24	2 (2.43%) Annual bleeding risk post GK was 1.2% at 1 year and 0.49% at 5 years.	Total 20 (24.4%) 1 radiation necrosis (1.2)	symptomatic 6 (7.31%) 1 radiation necrosis (1.2)	—	0 (0)	—	5 (6.1)	2/5 obliteration at 3 and 2 years post repeat GK	
Missios et al. 2014 [52]	165	82 (53.9)	Mean 43.6 (±SD17.4)	Cerebral 125 (75.7%) Deep 23 (13.9) brainstem 9 (5.5) thalamus/basal ganglia 14 (8.5) cerebellum 13 (7.9) Other 4 (2.4)	—	111 (67.3) II 67 (40.6) III 69 (41.8) IV 16 (10.9)	—	Mean 2.74 (0.8-5.9)	22 (13.3)	1-2 (0.1-10.1)	Embolization 0 (0) Surgical resection 5 (3.0)	41 (24.8)	36 (21.8)	22 (13.3)	Mean 6.3 (0.05-46.8)	Mean 17.9 (10-28)	Mean 36.2 (1-158)	165	70 (42.42) Actual rates for 3, 4, 5 years are: 46%, 54.66	—	40 months (95% CI 28.4-51.6)	Angiography	7 (4.2%)	symptomatic 14 (9.05%)	—	8 (4.8)	—	Total 3 (1.81), 1/3 cerebral edema 1/3 intractable seizure	38 (23.0)	—	
Nicolato et al. 2002 [54]	242	102 (42.1)	Mean 33.2 (±5.74)	Cerebral 209 (86.4) Deep 13 (5.4) Brainstem 3 (1.2) Basal Ganglia 3 (1.2)	—	114 (57.3) II 87 (42.7) III 89 (36.8) IV 5 (2.1)	—	—	—	—	Embolization 116 (47.9) Surgical resection 9 (3.7) Previous RICH 2 (1.1)	137 (56.6)	75 (30)	16 (6)	3.12 (0.1-10)	22.9 (14-28)	Not stated "mini months"	191	111/131 (84.8) 131 had minimum 2 years follow-up	111/131 (84.8) 131 had minimum 2 years follow-up	Mean 27.7 (6.2-76.3)	Angiography 131	5/191 (2.6%)	8/191 (4.2)	4/191 (2.1)	—	—	total 2/191 (1.04), 1/2 RICH 1/2 unrelated	—	—	
Oono et al. 2006 [56]	100	48 (52.7)	33 (9-66)	Cerebrum 9 (9%) Deep 9 (9%) Basal Ganglia 4 (4%) Thalamus 3 (3%) Brainstem 2 (2%)	—	d	—	—	—	—	Previous LPNAC 13 (14.3%) Basal GK 4 (15.8%)	40 (44)	—	—	4.3 (0.2-27.2)	20 (13-24)	32	91	Actual obliteration rates: 35 years of 21/72%	Actual obliteration rates: 35 years of 21/72%	—	Angiography and MRI	12 (12%)	—	8 (8%) including 5 radiation necrosis (3.5) and 3 symptomatic (3.3)	—	—	Total 3 (3.3), 3/3 RICH	18 (20)	Overall primary and secondary GK 35 years obliteration rates of 21 and 72%	
Pan et al. 2000 [57]	240	104 (43.3)	Mean 28 (2-77 years)	Leber 133 (55.4) Deep 59 (24.6) Brainstem 24 (10) Thalamus 20 (8.3) Cerebellum 21 (8.8) Intracranial 8 (3.3)	—	138 (57.3) II 48 (20.1) III 67 (27.9) IV 74 (30.8) V 3 (1.25)	—	6.15	—	—	Embolization 5 (2.1) Surgical resection 33 (13.8) Radiotherapy 3 (1.25)	178 (74)	70 (29)	—	6.15 (±SD 8.01)	Mean 19.1	26 (12-73)	240	131 who underwent angiography 115 (80) Actual obliteration rate 40 months is 75%	131 who underwent angiography 115 (80) Actual obliteration rate 40 months is 75%	—	Angiography 131	10 (4.1%)	Total 115 (47.9) including symptomatic 7 (2.9)	Symptomatic 8 (3.3)	—	—	Total 1 (0.42)	15 (6.3)	Obliteration 9/15	
Parkthak et al. 2013 [58]	102	49 (48%)	34 years (IQR 22-50)	—	—	135 (14.5%) II 34 (12.2%) III 26 (25.2%) IV 8 (8%) Superficial 60 (59)	Deep 42 (41.2%) Superficial 60 (59)	1.5	14 (14)	—	Embolization 66 (64.7%) Surgical resection 2 (2.0%) Endovascular and Surgical resection 1 (0.98%)	41 (40)	36 (35)	—	3.95 (IQR 0.95-5.9)	Mean 18.5 (12-24)	63 months (IQR 35-103)	102	82 who had 3 year angiographic follow-up: 50 (79)	82 who had 3 year angiographic follow-up: 50 (79)	—	Angiography 63 patients	3 (2.9%)	Total 17 (16.6%)	Necrosis 7 (6.9%)	2 (1.9) Cyst incidence included in necrosis	Total 4 (3.9), 2/4 RICH and 2/4 of unrelated causes	19 (18.6)	11/19		
Pollock et al. 2016 [64] 1990-1999 cohort	160	84 (52.5)	36 (3-82)	Deep 32 (20.0)	128 (80.0)	Spectroscopic: A 167 (48.4) B 58 (38.5) C 35 (21.9)	—	2.8 (0.6-6.1)	—	1.46 (0.41-5.92)	Embolization: 5 (3.1%) Surgical resection: 15 (9.4)	55 (34.4)	—	—	5.7 (0.4-45.8)	18.0 (15.0-22.0)	Clinical 93 (57-290)	160	130/160 (81.3), 4 year and 8-year obliteration rate of group 1 patients was 67.9% and 86.1%,	130/160 (81.3), 4 year and 8-year obliteration rate of group 1 patients was 67.9% and 86.1%,	—	Angiography and MRI	37 (9.7%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (296 person-years)	—	Symptomatic 23 (14.4%)	4 (1.05)/23 who experienced permanent RICH	—	—	Total 14 (5.7), 13/14 RICH 1/14 radiation necrosis	26 (16.3)	—
Pollock et al. 2016 [64] 1990-2009 cohort	221	128 (57.9)	42 (5-71)	Deep 30 (13.6)	165 (74.7)	Spectroscopic: A 167 (48.4) B 58 (38.5) C 35 (21.9)	—	2.4 (0.6-6.1)	—	1.31 (0.21-4.40)	Embolization: 16 (25.0) Surgical resection: 15 (9.4) Previous GK 1 (0.5%) LINAC 7 (3.2%)	63 (28.5)	—	—	3.6 (0.1-35.4)	20.0 (15.0-25.0)	Clinical 93 (57-290)	221	160/221 (72.4), 4 year and 8-year obliteration rate of group 1 patients was 67.9% and 86.1%,	160/221 (72.4), 4 year and 8-year obliteration rate of group 1 patients was 67.9% and 86.1%,	—	Angiography and MRI	37 (9.7%) Annual hemorrhage rate 1.7% (296 person-years)	—	Symptomatic 8 (3.6%)	4 (1.05)/23 who experienced permanent RICH	—	—	Total 14 (5.7), 13/14 RICH 1/14 radiation necrosis	38 (17.2)	—
Raboud et al. 2018 [65]	64	32 (50.0)	Mean 46 (13-79)	—	—	138 (14.2%) II 34 (12.2%) III 26 (25.6%) IV 7 (11.1%) V 4 (8.5%)	—	—	—	1.01-1.29 (46.0)	Embolization 16 (25.0) Surgical resection 1 (1.6) Previous GK 1 (1.6%) LINAC 7 (10.9%)	32 (50.0)	12 (18.8)	6 (9.4)	1.2 (0.02-11.3)	24 (18-26)	38 (12-75)	64	30/64 total (46.9%) 30/35 who underwent DSA 84.5%	29/63 Actual rates at 3/4/5 years were 37.6%, 45.6%, 63.3/72.7%	Mean 35 (8-56)	Angiography 55 MRI only 9	3 (4.7%)	Total 1 (1.56%) including symptomatic in 1 (1.56%)	0	0	1 (1.6)	Total 1 (1.75), 1/1 RICH	—	—	
Talasila et al. 2020 [71]	149	82 (55)	40 (18-68)	Symptomatic 128 (85.9%) Deep 7 (4.7%) Thalamus 6 (4%) Brainstem 1 (0.7%) Intracranial 8 (5.4%) Ventricular 6 (4%)	95 (63.8)	142 (28.2%) II 71 (47.7%) III 74 (48.2%) IV 0 (0)	Deep 32 (21.5%) Superficial 117 (78.5)	—	10 (6.7)	2002 Median 1.52 (0.4-2.9)	Embolization 0 (0)	0 (0)	66 (44.3)	32 (21.5)	2 (0.09-10)	24 (18-25)	46 (12-154)	149	104 (69.8) Actual obliteration at 3/4/5/8 years were 37.6%, 45.6%, 63.3/72.7%	104 (69.8) Actual obliteration at 3/4/5/8 years were 37.6%, 45.6%, 63.3/72.7%	36 (12-96)	MRI only 30 (20%) Angiography 119 (80%)	3 (2%)	Total 20 (13.4%)	symptomatic 5 (3.4%)	1 (0.7%)	—	—	—		
Zeiler et al. 2011 [74]	41	17 (41.2%)	40.9 (14-74)	Cerebral 34 (82.9%) Deep 4 (9.8%) Brainstem 2 (4.9%) Basal ganglia 6 (14.6%) Cerebellum 4 (9.8%)	—	17 (17.1%) II 9 (22.5%) III 21 (51.2%) IV 4 (9.8%) V 0 (0)	—	2.36	—	1.68	Embolization 1 (2.44%) Embolization and partial resection 1 (2.44%) Repeat GK 7 (17.1%)	18 (43.9)	24 (58.5)	9 (22.0)	5.05 cm ³	20.3 (6-26.4)	43.1	41	MRI OR CTA OR DSA 36 (87.8)	27.6	MRI OR CTA AND DSA 20 MRI OR CTA 16	2 (4.88%)	Total 11 (26.8%) including symptomatic in 7 (17.1%)	1 (2.44%)	—	—	3 (7.32)	5	1/5 obliteration		
Zhou et al. 2008 [75]	341	106 (31.1)	Mean 24.2 (1.1-79)	Leber 243 (71.3%) Deep 47 (13.8) Basal ganglia 19 (5.6%) Thalamus 14 (4.1%) Brain stem 14 (4.1%) Corpus callosum and ventricular 26 (7.6%) Cerebellum 25 (7.3%)	—	d	—	—	—	—	Embolization 54 (15.9%) Surgical resection 26 (7.6%)	171 (50.2)	78 (22.9)	24 (7.0)	Mean 5.4	Mean 20.5 (10 to 30)	76.8 (±SD 16.8)	341	—	267 (78.4) follow-up 18 months +3	—	DSA (11/341) MR/MRA (296/341) CT (12/341)	10 (2.9%)	Symptomatic 12 (3.52%)	symptomatic 3 (0.88%)	—	2 (0.6)	Total 4 (1.17), 3 RICH 1 AGE	3 (0.9)	—	

Abbreviations: AVM = arteriovenous malformation; EORT = fractional external beam radiation therapy; Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI); RBAS = modified Ransmaye Based Interventional malformation Score; SM = Spetzler-Martin, Stereotactic Radiography (SR); Vagus Radiation AVM Score (VRAS) = NA = Data not available.

¹ explicitly not stated that there were no malformations secondary to CRKS treatment—Deep locations, as defined by the Spetzler-Martin (SM) grading system, included arteriovenous, language, and visual cortex, hypothalamic and thalamic, lateral cerebellar, brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition of deep locations which includes the thalamus, thalamus/basal ganglia, brainstem, cerebellum, intracerebellar regions, and corpus callosum. Han et al. 2008 [11]: Deep location includes corpus callosum (in addition to basal ganglia/brainstem injury or significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis). * Modified radiographic-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. * Chang et al. 2000 [6]: Brainstem-located AVMs have been outlined alongside authors' definition

Abbreviations: AVM = arteriovenous malformation; EBRT = fractionated external beam radiation therapy; Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI); RBAS = modified Radiotherapy Based Anterior-posterior Infiltration Score; SM = Spetzler-Martin; Stereotactic Radiosurgery (SRS); Gamma Knife (GK) = Gamma Knife; YRAS = YRAS Score; NA = Data not available.

¹ explicitly we stated that these were to normalise secondary to GK treatment. Eloquent locations, as defined by the Spetzler-Martin (SM) grading system, included sensorimotor, language, and visual cortex, hypothalamus and thalamus, internal capsule, brain stem, cerebellar peduncles, and deep cerebellar nuclei. Deep locations, as defined by the modified radiotherapy-based AVM score (RBAS), included the thalamus, basal ganglia, and brain stem, unless stated otherwise. *Chang et al. 2009 [6]. Brainstem located AVMs have been included alongside authors' definition of deep locations which include the thalamus, lentiform nucleus, midbrain nucleus, and internal capsule but exclude brainstem. "Vertical" refers to radiological injury that included moderate to severe edema and radiation necrosis (included minor peritumoral edema). We not possible to reliably extract whether RICH score transient or permanent as excluded from final statistical analysis. Spetzler-Martin grade could not be calculated (venous drainage not stated). Bhargava et al. 2018 [33]. Deep location includes: basal ganglia, thalamus, brainstem, cerebellum, intraventricular region, and corpus callosum. Wu et al. 2008 [31]. classified "severe" post-radiotherapy injury as significant and this has been reflected in the data included in this analysis. "Superficial" includes cerebral hemispheres, lateral ventricles, paranasal/paraventricular regions, corpus callosum, cerebellar tentorium.

APPENDIX 7. Summary of methodological characteristics of the included studies

<i>Study set-up</i>	
Multi-center	1 (3%)
Single-center	33 (97%)
<i>Continent (Single-centre only)</i>	
North-America	13 (39%)
Europe	8 (24%)
Asia	12 (36%)
<i>Reporting of the selection criteria of the study</i>	
Specified	23 (68%)
No specified	33 (32%)
<i>Participant identification</i>	
Retrospective	33 (97%)
Prospective	1 (3%)
Unspecified	0 (0%)
<i>Reporting of consecutive patients</i>	
Yes	8 (24%)
No	7 (21%)
Not specified	19 (56%)
<i>Participant follow-up</i>	
Retrospective	33 (88%)
Prospective	4 (12%)
Unspecified	0 (0%)

APPENDIX 8. Moderator analysis/Meta-regression

Characteristic	Haemorrhage	PRIC	TRIC	Angio-obliteration	Angio/MRI-obliteration
Age, %				0.018	
Male, %					
Study Midyear				0.021	
Margin Dose, Gy					
AVM Volume, cm ³					
Deep venous drainage, %	0.005				0.035
Eloquent location, %	0.026				
Deep location, %		0.005	0.002		
Cells shaded green indicate statistical significance (P<0.05) with actual values of significance stated within corresponding cells.					

APPENDIX 9. Funnel Plots

