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Risk of bias table from das Neves et al 19

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bias | Author’s judgement | Support for judgement |
| Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Unclear risk | "... in this prospective, randomized and double blinded study...". The 2 groups were balanced in the demographic characteristics (table 1). |
| Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Allocation concealment method not stated. |
| Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Low risk | Double-blind. No further description in the article. Participant likely to be blinded as spinal injection was prepared by the anesthesiologist at her back. |
| Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Low risk | "... prospective, randomized and double blind study..." |
| Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Low risk | No missing outcome data. Recruitment and attrition data presented. Analyses performed using intention to treat principle. |
| Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | All prespecified outcomes reported. |
| Other bias | Low risk | Appears to be free of other bias. Sample size calculation performed. |

Risk of bias table for Richardson et al 22

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bias | Author’s judgement | Support for judgement |
| Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Unclear risk | This prospective, randomized, double-blinded study was approved by the institutional human subjects review board. Subjects were randomized to the hyperbaric or isobaric bupivacaine group. |
| Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Allocation concealment method not stated. |
| Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Low risk | Double-blind. Participant likely to be blinded as spinal injection was prepared by the anesthesiologist at her back. Blinded observer was involved in outcome assessment. |
| Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Low risk | "... prospective, randomized and double bind study..." |
| Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Low risk | No missing outcome data. Recruitment and attrition data presented. Analyses performed using intention to treat principle. |
| Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | All prespecified outcomes reported. |
| Other bias | Low risk | Appears to be free of other bias. Sample size calculation performed. |

Risk of bias table for Russell et al 21

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bias | Author’s judgement | Support for judgement |
| Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Unclear risk | "They were randomly allocated to receive either 0.5% glucose-free bupivacaine 2.5ml (isobaric...)." The 2 groups were balanced in the demographic characteristics. |
| Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Allocation concealment method not stated. |
| Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Low risk | Double-blind. No further description in the article. Participant likely to be blinded as spinal injection was prepared by the anesthesiologist at her back. |
| Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Low risk | "... prospective, randomized and double blind study..." |
| Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Low risk | No missing outcome data. Recruitment and attrition data presented. Analyses performed using intention to treat principle. |
| Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | All prespecified outcomes reported. |
| Other bias | Low risk | Appears to be free of other bias. Sample size calculation performed. |

Risk of bias table for Sarvela [et](#_ENREF_7) al 7

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bias | Author’s judgement | Support for judgement |
| Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Low risk | Computer generated random numbers. |
| Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Allocation concealment method not stated. |
| Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Low risk | Double-blind. No further description in the article. Participant likely to be blinded as spinal injection was prepared by the anesthesiologist at her back. |
| Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Low risk | "... prospective, randomized and double blind study..." |
| Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Low risk | No missing outcome data. Recruitment and attrition data presented. Analyses performed using intention to treat principle. |
| Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | All prespecified outcomes reported. |
| Other bias | Low risk | Appears to be free of other bias. Sample size calculation performed. |

Risk of bias table for Vercauteren et al 6

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bias | Author’s judgement | Support for judgement |
| Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Unclear risk | "in a double-blind, randomized trial,..." (in the abstract). The 2 groups were balanced in the demographic characteristics. |
| Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Allocation concealment not stated. |
| Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Low risk | Double-blind. No further description in the article. Participant likely to be blinded as spinal injection was prepared by the anesthesiologist at her back. |
| Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Low risk | "... prospective, randomized and double blind study..." |
| Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Low risk | No missing outcome data. Recruitment and attrition data presented. Analyses performed using intention to treat principle. |
| Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | All prespecified outcomes reported. |
| Other bias | Low risk | Appears to be free of other bias. Sample size calculation performed. |

Risk of bias table for Vichitvejpaisal et al 20

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| Bias | Author’s judgement | Support for judgement |
| Random sequence generation (selection bias) | Unclear risk | "This led us to perform a randomized double-blind study...". The 2 groups were balanced in the demographic characteristics. |
| Allocation concealment (selection bias) | Unclear risk | Not stated in the study. |
| Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) | Low risk | Double-blind. No further description in the article. Participant likely to be blinded as spinal injection was prepared by the anesthesiologist at her back. |
| Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) | Low risk | "... prospective, randomized and double blind study..." |
| Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) | Low risk | No missing outcome data. Recruitment and attrition data presented. Analyses performed using intention-to-treat principle. |
| Selective reporting (reporting bias) | Low risk | All prespecified outcomes reported. |
| Other bias | Low risk | Appears to be free of other bias. Sample size calculation performed. |