	Treatment			Control			Mean Diff. with 95% CI	Weight (%)
Study	N	Mean	SD	N	Mean	SD		
QLB1								
Krohg	20	3.1	2.47	20	2.3	1.92	0.80 [−0.57, 2.17]	7.47
Parras	48	.7083	2.1	49	2.6122	2.1588	−1.90 [−2.75, −1.06]	8.15
Faiz	38	3.47	.76	38	4.02	.85	−0.55 [−0.91, −0.19]	8.54
Kumar	35	3.65	1.73	35	3.68	1.07	−0.03 [−0.70, 0.64]	8.32
Baytar	54	.09	.29	53	.11	.37	−0.02 [−0.15, 0.11]	8.63
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 0.28$, $I^2 = 84.94\%$, $H^2 = 6.64$							−0.39 [−0.94, 0.16]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(4) = 26.56, p = 0.00								
QLB2								
Tamura	36	2.67	1.6	38	2.42	1.12	0.25 [−0.38, 0.88]	8.37
Ishio	35	1.5	1.8	35	4.4	2.1	−2.90 [−3.82, −1.98]	8.08
Yousef	30	1.9	.32	30	3.2	.43	−1.30 [−1.49, −1.11]	8.61
Kang	22	4.868	.7536	22	.3181	.451	4.55 [4.18, 4.92]	8.54
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 11.96$, $I^2 = 99.63\%$, $H^2 = 268.04$							0.16 [−3.24, 3.56]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(3) = 804.11, p = 0.00								
TQLB								
Kilic	22	.95	.84	22	3.45	1.01	−2.50 [−3.05, −1.95]	8.43
Kang	23	3.0478	1.4625	22	.3181	.451	2.73 [2.09, 3.37]	8.35
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 13.58$, $I^2 = 99.33\%$, $H^2 = 148.16$							0.11 [−5.01, 5.24]	
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(1) = 148.16, p = 0.00								
QLB type not reported								
He	30	2	.5	30	3.8	1.1	−1.80 [−2.23, −1.37]	8.51
Overall							−0.22 [−1.24, 0.80]	
Heterogeneity: $\tau^2 = 3.14$, $I^2 = 98.94\%$, $H^2 = 94.12$								
Test of $\theta_i = \theta_j$: Q(11) = 1035.27, p = 0.00								
Test of group differences: $Q_b(2) = 16.44$, p = 0.00								

Random−effects DerSimonian−Laird model

Favors QLB   Favors control

Figure S3.
 Forest plot showing the postoperative pain grade at rest at 24 hours. Subgroup analyses presented according to the QLB type.
The sample size, mean, SDs and pooled estimates of mean difference (MD) are shown.
The 95% CIs are shown as lines for individual studies and as diamonds for pooled estimates.