

SUPPLEMENTAL DIGITAL CONTENT 6

This table also appears in the Supplemental Digital Content 2 in the complete set of evidence tools.

Table 4. Balanced crystalloids compared to Normal saline in patients with sepsis or septic shock

Author(s): Alhazzani W, Perner A

Date: December 2 2015

Question: Balanced crystalloids compared to Normal saline in in patients with sepsis or septic shock

Setting: ICU

Bibliography: Rochweg B, Alhazzani W, Sindi A, Heels-Ansdell D, Thabane L, Fox-Robichaud A et al. Fluid resuscitation in sepsis: a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med.* 2014;161(5):347-55. doi:10.7326/M14-0178.

Quality assessment							No of patients		Effect		Quality	Importance
No of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Balanced crystalloids	Normal saline	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)		
Mortality												
N/A	randomized trials ¹	not serious	not serious	Very serious ²	serious ³	none	N/A	25.0%	RR 0.78 (0.58 to 1.05)	55 fewer per 1000 (from 13 more to 105 fewer)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Renal Replacement Therapy												
N/A	randomized trials ¹	not serious	not serious ⁴	Very serious ²	serious ⁵	none	N/A	23.0% ⁶	RR 0.85 (0.56 to 1.30)	35 fewer per 1000 (from 69 more to 101 fewer)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL

								51.0% ⁶		77 fewer per 1000 (from 153 more to 224 fewer)		
--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--	--------------------	--	--	--	--

MD – mean difference, RR – relative risk

1. There are no head to head RCTs on this question, we used the estimates from network meta-analysis (indirect comparison)
2. We downgraded by two levels for indirectness, we used data from indirect comparison only, no direct comparison studies are available
3. We downgraded the quality of evidence by one level for imprecision, the CI includes significant benefit and small harm.
4. We could not assess inconsistency as all the evidence is derived from indirect comparisons
5. We downgraded the quality of evidence by one level for imprecision, the CI contained both significant benefit and harm
6. Data from Rangel-Frausto et al.