

G.6.1.5 Angiotensin II receptor antagonist versus calcium-channel blocker

| Quality assessment | | | | | | No of patients | | Effect estimate | Quality |
|--|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|-------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|--------------------|---------|
| No of studies | Design | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Angiotensin II receptor antagonist | Calcium channel blocker | Summary of results | |
| Cognition – MMSE (6 months) – higher numbers favour angiotensin II receptor antagonist | | | | | | | | | |

| Quality assessment | | | | | | No of patients | | Effect estimate | Quality |
|--|--------|--------------|--------------|---------------|----------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|----------|
| No of studies | Design | Risk of bias | Indirectness | Inconsistency | Imprecision | Angiotensin II receptor antagonist | Calcium channel blocker | Summary of results | |
| 1 (Kume 2012) | RCT | Not serious | Not serious | N/A | Serious ¹ | 10 | 10 | MD 1.3 (-1.80, 4.40) | Moderate |
| Cognition – ADAS-cog (6 months) – lower numbers favour angiotensin II receptor antagonist | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 (Kume 2012) | RCT | Not serious | Not serious | N/A | Serious ¹ | 10 | 10 | MD -4.2 (-9.42, 1.02) | Moderate |
| 1. Non-significant result | | | | | | | | | |