Management of penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries: An eastern association for the surgery of trauma practice management guideline

Patrick L. Bosarge, MD¹, John J. Como, MD, MPH², Nicole Fox, MD³, Yngve Falck-Ytter,
MD⁴, Elliott R. Haut, MD, PhD⁵, Heath A. Dorion, MD⁶, Nimitt J. Patel, MD², Amy Rushing,
MD⁷, Lauren A. Raff, MD¹, Amy A. McDonald, MD², Bryce RH Robinson, MD, MS⁸, Gerald McGwin, Jr, PhD⁹, and Richard P. Gonzalez, MD¹⁰

¹ University of Alabama at Birmingham, Department of Surgery, Birmingham, AL

² Metrohealth Medical Center, Case Western Reserve University, Department of Surgery,

Cleveland, OH

³ Cooper University Health Care, Department of Surgery, Camden, NJ

⁴ Case Western Reserve University, Division of Gastroenterology, Case and VA Medical Center, Cleveland, OH

⁵ The Johns Hopkins Hospital, Department of Surgery, Baltimore, MD

⁶ Mercy Health St. Elizabeth Youngstown Hospital, Department of Surgery, Youngstown, Ohio

⁷ Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center, Department of Surgery, Columbus, OH

⁸ Harborview Medical Center, University of Washington, Department of Surgery, Seattle, WA

⁹ University of Alabama at Birmingham, Department of Epidemiology, Birmingham, AL

¹⁰ Loyola University Medical Center, Department of Surgery, Maywood, IL



Submitted: November 11, 2015

Accepted: December 4, 2015

Address for reprints

Patrick L. Bosarge, MD, FACS

Division of Trauma, Burns, and Surgical Critical Care

University of Alabama, Birmingham

University of Alabama Medical Center

112 Lyons-Harrison Research Building

701 19th Street South

Birmingham, AL 35294

T 205-934-4911

F 205-975-7294

E pbosarge@uabmc.edu



Background: The management of penetrating rectal trauma invokes a complex decision tree that advocates the principles of proximal diversion (Diversion) of the fecal stream, irrigation of stool from the distal rectum (DRW), and presacral drainage (PD) based on data from World War II and the Vietnam War. This guideline seeks to define the initial operative management principles for nondestructive extraperitoneal rectal injuries.

Methods: A systematic review of the MEDLINE database using PubMed was performed. The search retrieved English language articles regarding penetrating rectal trauma from January 1900 to July 2014. Letters to the editor, case reports, book chapters, and review articles were excluded. Topics of investigation included the management principles of Diversion, DRW and PD using the GRADE methodology.

Results: 306 articles were screened leading to a full text review of 56 articles. Nineteen articles were used to formulate the recommendations of this guideline.

Conclusion: This guideline consists of three conditional evidence based recommendations. First, we conditionally recommend proximal diversion for management of these injuries. Second, we conditionally recommend the avoidance of routine presacral drains and distal rectal washout in the management of these injuries.

Key words: extraperitoneal, rectal injury, guideline, nondestructive, fecal diversion, distal rectal irrigation, presacral drain



Background

The management of penetrating rectal trauma invokes a complex decision tree that has been established based on lessons learned in wartime. The classic teaching for the management of penetrating rectal trauma advocates the principles of proximal diversion (Diversion) of the fecal stream, irrigation of stool from the distal rectum (DRW), and presacral drainage (PD). Today, these techniques are used variably by clinicians based on available literature that has been published over the last 40 years. In the development of this guideline, management principles were concerned specifically with those injuries most commonly seen in civilian trauma, specifically low velocity rectal wounds. In terms of nomenclature, these would be considered nondestructive injuries. Nondestructive rectal injuries have been defined as those with less than 25% loss of circumference (1). In addition, this PMG addresses the anatomic location of the injury as being extraperitoneal, and we recommend that intraperitoneal injuries should be managed as any other colon injury (2).

Objectives

The objective of this guideline was to evaluate the use of Diversion, distal rectal washout (DRW), and presacral drainage (PD) in nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries. The Population (P), Intervention (I), Comparator (C) and Outcome (O) questions were defined as follows:

PICO Question 1: In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries (P), should proximal diversion (I) be performed versus no proximal diversion with primary repair (if feasible) (C) to decrease the incidence of complications (O)?



4

PICO Question 2: In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries (P), should pre-sacral drainage (I) versus no pre-sacral drainage (C) be performed to decrease the incidence of complications (O)?

PICO Question 3: In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries (P), should distal rectal washout be performed (I) versus no distal rectal washout (C) to decrease the incidence of complications (O)?

Identification of References

With the assistance of a professional medical librarian, a search of the National Library of Medicine and the National Institutes of Health MEDLINE database was conducted using PubMed and IndexCat, as well as proprietary indices hosted by Elsevier (Scopus) and EBSCO (CINAHL) with citations published between January 1900 and July 2014. We used the "related articles" function to broaden the search and scan all citations for relevance. In addition to the electronic search, we manually searched the bibliographies of recent reviews and papers. Articles were limited to those in the English language involving human subjects. A systematic review of the available databases using PubMed, IndexCat, Scopus, and CINAHL was performed with the following search terms: "rectum", "rectal", "anorectal", "trauma", "wound", "injury", "penetrating", "firearm", "gunshot", "stab", "impale", and "human." Letters to the editor, single case reports, book chapters, and review articles were excluded. Articles that focused specifically on injuries related to combat were excluded. Additionally, pediatric literature was included in the search; however none of the data addressed the PICO questions. Of the 306 articles identified, 250 were eliminated for not relating to the PICO questions or not meeting inclusion criteria. The



remaining 56 articles were each reviewed by two committee members to determine eligibility in this review. This resulted in 18 articles meeting inclusion criteria and addressing the PICO questions that had been formulated to create these guidelines (Figure 1).

Outcome Measure Types

Per the GRADE approach, outcomes were chosen by the committee and rated in importance from 1 to 9 with scores of 7-9 representing critical outcomes (Table 1). For all PICO questions, the following outcomes were considered by committee members: mortality, sepsis, intra-abdominal infection, postoperative intervention, fistula development, bleeding complications, stoma complications, soft tissue infection, incontinence, antibiotic timing, and antibiotic complications.

The outcomes deemed critical by vote of the committee included mortality, sepsis, and intra-abdominal infection. Unfortunately, sepsis and intra-abdominal infection were not uniformly delineated in the identified studies, thus the committee combined these two outcomes into infectious complications. The remainder of the outcomes were considered not critical by the committee and were not used in the decision making process.

Data Extraction and Methodology

Following identification of the potentially pertinent 56 articles, each article was assigned to two committee members for extraction of data for each PICO in question. Due to the small numbers reported, as well as heterogeneity and variability in reporting of data among the articles, meta-analysis was not practical for this guideline. Of the articles that were identified, only two were prospective, one observational (1) and one randomized (3).





Fourteen articles were identified which addressed PICO #1 (1, 3-17). Data reported for mortality and infectious complications were pooled to determine overall rates. Intrinsic limitations of the data existed due to heterogeneity, non-standardized study designs, and incomplete reporting of complications. Additionally, several studies did not delineate between intraperitoneal and extraperitoneal injuries.

PICO #2

Seventeen articles were reviewed by the committee from which data was extracted to address PICO #2 (1, 3-6, 8-19). Similarly to PICO #1, data reported for the outcomes of mortality and infectious complications were pooled to determine overall rates. The same limitations seen with PICO #1 existed.

PICO #3

Thirteen articles were available to address PICO #3 (1, 5-12, 14-17). The data obtained for the outcomes of mortality and infectious complications were pooled to determine overall rates. This data set was limited similarly to the data for PICOs #1 and #2.

<u>RESULTS FOR PICO Question #1 (Table 2)</u>

In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal injuries (P), should proximal diversion (I) be performed versus primary repair (if feasible) without proximal diversion (C) to decrease the incidence of infectious complications (O)?



Qualitative Synthesis

Proximal diversion has been considered the hallmark of management for penetrating rectal injuries since World War II. Literature comparing diversion versus non-diversion is significantly lacking in the present literature pool. Upon this review, 14 studies have taken into consideration the critical outcomes of mortality and infectious complications in the setting of proximal diversion. The non-diversion comparator group is quite small (26 patients) versus the diversion group (532 patients). Only one study was prospective in nature for this PICO, which had a small number of participants (1). In that study, Gonzalez and colleagues assigned 14 patients to one of two algorithms for treatment of nondestructive extraperitoneal rectal injuries, neither of which involved colostomy formation. No patient in the study had an infectious complication related to the rectal injury nor was there mortality. This one study represents over half of the patients (14/26) identified in the literature treated without colostomy for extraperitoneal rectal injuries. Overall, there is no reported mortality in the non-diversion group (0/26), while the diversion group has a mortality rate of 1.7% (9/523). Unfortunately, it is unclear as to whether death in these patients was specifically related to the complications of the rectal injury or is related to overall trauma burden to include hemorrhagic shock. Regarding the second critical outcome of infectious complications, the diversion group had nearly a 50% reduction (Diversion 8.8% vs. Non-diversion 18.2%) of overall infectious complications.

Quantitative Synthesis (Meta-Analysis)

Meta-analysis was not appropriate due to the small numbers reported, as well as heterogeneity and variability in reporting of data among the articles.



Grading the Evidence

The overwhelming majority of data related to this PICO was retrospective and observational in nature. Using the GRADE framework for evaluating the data related to the outcomes of mortality and infectious complications, the quality of the data for this specific PICO question suffers due to risk of bias and imprecision. Bias was assigned because of the majority of the studies use historical controls. Imprecision was determined due to the very low numbers of events seen within the comparator group. Due to these factors, the overall quality of evidence has been determined to be very low.

Recommendation

Within the GRADE framework, once the overall quality of evidence across studies and outcomes is determined, the guideline panel formulates a recommendation that considers the following: quality of evidence, balance between desirable and undesirable outcomes, patients' values and preferences, and cost/resource use. Despite the overall quality of evidence being very low, the panel considered that most patients would place a high value on avoidance of mortality and infectious complications. All of these factors resulted in the formulation of a conditional recommendation by the committee. The committee concludes that the desirable effects of adherence to a recommendation probably outweigh the undesirable effects. Thus, in patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries, we conditionally recommend proximal diversion (vs. non-diversion).



RESULTS FOR PICO Question #2

In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries (P) should presacral drainage (I) versus no pre-sacral drainage (C) be performed to decrease incidence of infectious complications (O)?

Qualitative Synthesis

Advocated for the management of penetrating rectal injuries since World War II, the use of PD began to significantly decline after Gonzalez reported in a small, albeit important, randomized prospective study involving 50 patients randomized to two arms of which the first was diversion and PD and the other was diversion and no PD (3). Two patients died from complications unrelated to the rectal injury. Therefore, 23 patients underwent PD and 25 patients underwent no PD. There was no statistical difference in complications between the groups.

Upon formulation of this guideline, 17 studies have addressed the critical outcomes of mortality and infectious complications in the setting of presacral drainage. The no presacral drainage comparator group had a total of 267 patients versus the presacral drainage group of 395 patients. Overall mortality in the presacral drainage group was 1.77% versus 0.75% in the group without presacral drain. Similar to PICO #1, the pooled data is not clear as to whether death is specifically related to the management of the rectal injury or if death is related to overall trauma burden from associated injuries and hemorrhage, which seems likely. Regarding the second critical outcome of infectious complications, the no presacral drain group had a 40% reduction of overall infectious complications (No PD 5.71% versus PD 9.63%).



Quantitative Synthesis (Meta-Analysis)

Meta-analysis was not appropriate due to the small numbers reported, as well as heterogeneity and variability in reporting of data among the articles.

Grading the Evidence

Using the GRADE framework for evaluating the data related to the outcomes of mortality and infectious complications, one randomized prospective study was specific to this PICO, which represented approximately 7% of the total pooled data, with the remainder of the data being retrospective and observational in nature. No serious inconsistency was detected, however serious concerns for risk of bias and imprecision were noted among the representative studies. The inconsistency in study design and data reporting lowered the grade for this PICO. Therefore, the overall quality of evidence was considered very low by the committee.

Recommendation

"In patients with nondestructive extraperitoneal rectal injuries, we conditionally recommend against the routine use of presacral drains.

RESULTS FOR PICO Question #3

In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries (P) should distal rectal washout be performed (I) vs. no distal rectal washout (C) to decrease the incidence of infectious complications (O)?



Qualitative Synthesis

Distal washout of stool from the rectum after penetrating wounds is a historical staple of management for rectal injuries. Many clinicians today have eliminated this component of management from their practices. Thirteen studies were included to adjudicate this PICO. The non-DRW comparator group contained 301 patients versus the DRW group of 202 patients. Mortality for the group non-DRW group was 1.37% versus 0.99% in the DRW group. Like all PICO questions, the data is not clear as to whether death was related to the rectal injury management or if death is related to overall trauma burden from associated injuries. The second critical outcome of infectious complications demonstrated no difference between the groups (non DRW 10.30% versus DRW 9.90%).

Quantitative Synthesis (Meta-Analysis)

Meta-analysis was not appropriate due to the small numbers reported, as well as heterogeneity and variability in reporting of data among the articles.

Grading the Evidence

Using the GRADE framework for evaluating the data related to the outcomes of mortality and infectious complications, there was only one prospective observational study for this PICO, and this paper included small numbers of participants (14 patients) that were not managed with DRW, without a comparator group (1). The overwhelming data related to this PICO was retrospective and observational in nature. No serious risk of bias was detected; however inconsistency among the studies in design and data reporting lowered the grade for this PICO. Therefore, the overall quality of evidence was considered very low by the committee.



Recommendation

In patients with nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries, we conditionally recommend not performing distal rectal washout (vs. performance of distal rectal washout).

Using These Guidelines in Clinical Practice

These guidelines represent a detailed summary and comprehensive overview of the literature regarding the evaluation and treatment of penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries. The literature available for review conditionally supports the use of proximal diversion for avoidance of infectious complications. Further, the literature supports a conditional recommendation for not performing presacral drainage and distal rectal washout to avoid infectious complications. The recommendations are meant to inform the decision making process and not replace clinical judgment as individual patient circumstances/conditions may dictate variation to the suggested recommendations. The data regarding mortality related to each PICO is questionable to the committee because the raw reporting of mortality was overwhelmingly unaccompanied by explanation of the cause of death.

Conclusion

In summary, we propose three conditional evidence based recommendations regarding management of nondestructive extraperitoneal penetrating rectal injury in the non-combat injured which were formulated using the GRADE methodology. First, we conditionally recommend proximal diversion for management of these injuries. Second, we conditionally



recommend the avoidance of routine presacral drains and distal rectal washout in the management of these injuries.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

P.L.B., J.J.C., and E.R.H. conceived of this study. P.L.B., J.J.C., H.A.D., R.P.G., E.R.H.,
A.A.M., N.J.P., L.A.R., and A.R. developed the PICO questions. P.L.B., J.J.C., H.A.D., N.F.,
R.P.G., A.A.M., N.J.P., L.A.R., and A.R. examined the literature. P.L.B., J.J.C., H.A.D., N.F.,
R.P.G., A.A.M., N.J.P., L.A.R., and A.R. performed data extraction. P.L.B., J.J.C., H.A.D.,
Y.F.Y., N.F., R.P.G., E.R.H., A.A.M., G.M., N.J.P., L.A.R., and A.R. contributed to data
interpretation. P.L.B., J.J.C., Y.F.Y., N.F., and B.R. wrote the manuscript.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Committee would like to thank Carolyn M. Holmes of the Lister Hill Library of the Health Sciences at the University of Alabama at Birmingham for assistance in identifying all of the literature used in order to develop this PMG.

We also thank the Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma (EAST) and the EAST Foundation for the opportunity to write this manuscript and the detail-oriented peer review of this manuscript by the practice management guidelines section.





References

 Gonzalez RP, Phelan H, 3rd, Hassan M, Ellis CN, Rodning CB. Is fecal diversion necessary for nondestructive penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries? J Trauma.
 2006;61(4):815-9.

2. Pasquale M, Fabian TC. Practice management guidelines for trauma from the Eastern Association for the Surgery of Trauma. J Trauma. 1998;44(6):941-56; discussion 56-7.

3. Gonzalez RP, Falimirski ME, Holevar MR. The role of presacral drainage in the management of penetrating rectal injuries. The Journal of trauma. 1998;45(4):656-61.

4. Bartizal JF, Boyd DR, Folk FA, Smith D, Lescher TC, Freeark RJ. A critical review of management of 392 colonic and rectal injuries. Dis Colon Rectum. 1974;17(3):313-8.

5. Vitale GC, Richardson JD, Flint LM. Successful management of injuries to the extraperitoneal rectum. The American surgeon. 1983;49(3):159-62.

6. Mangiante EC, Graham AD, Fabian TC. Rectal gunshot wounds. Management of civilian injuries. Am Surg. 1986;52(1):37-40.

7. Shannon FL, Moore EE, Moore FA, McCroskey BL. Value of distal colon washout in civilian rectal trauma--reducing gut bacterial translocation. J Trauma. 1988;28(7):989-94.

8. Burch JM, Feliciano DV, Mattox KL. Colostomy and drainage for civilian rectal injuries: is that all? Ann Surg. 1989;209(5):600-10; discussion 10-1.

Thomas DD, Levison MA, Dykstra BJ, Bender JS. Management of rectal injuries.
 Dogma versus practice. Am Surg. 1990;56(8):507-10.

10. Ivatury RR, Licata J, Gunduz Y, Rao P, Stahl WM. Management options in penetrating rectal injuries. Am Surg. 1991;57(1):50-5.



Bostick PJ, Johnson DA, Heard JF, Islas JT, Sims EH, Fleming AW, Sterling-Scott RP.
 Management of extraperitoneal rectal injuries. J Natl Med Assoc. 1993;85(6):460-3.

12. Levy RD, Strauss P, Aladgem D, Degiannis E, Boffard KD, Saadia R. Extraperitoneal rectal gunshot injuries. J Trauma. 1995;38(2):273-7.

13. Steinig JP, Boyd CR. Presacral drainage in penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries: is it necessary? Am Surg. 1996;62(9):765-7.

14. Navsaria PH, Shaw JM, Zellweger R, Nicol AJ, Kahn D. Diagnostic laparoscopy and diverting sigmoid loop colostomy in the management of civilian extraperitoneal rectal gunshot injuries. Br J Surg. 2004;91(4):460-4.

Shatnawi NJ, Bani-Hani KE. Management of civilian extraperitoneal rectal injuries.
 Asian J Surg. 2006;29(1):11-6.

16. Navsaria PH, Edu S, Nicol AJ. Civilian extraperitoneal rectal gunshot wounds: surgical management made simpler. World J Surg. 2007;31(6):1345-51.

17. Ahmed N, Thekkeurumbil S, Mathavan V, Janzen M, Tasse J, Chung R. Simplified management of low-energy projectile extraperitoneal rectal injuries. J Trauma. 2009;67(6):1270-1.

18. McGrath V, Fabian TC, Croce MA, Minard G, Pritchard FE. Rectal trauma: management based on anatomic distinctions. Am Surg. 1998;64(12):1136-41.

Weinberg JA, Fabian TC, Magnotti LJ, Minard G, Bee TK, Edwards N, Claridge JA,
 Croce MA. Penetrating rectal trauma: management by anatomic distinction improves outcome. J
 Trauma. 2006;60(3):508-13; discussion 13-14.







guide.medlive.cn

Outcome	Average	Importance	Include in GRADE evidence profile		
Mortality	8.7	Critical	Yes		
Sepsis	8.3	Critical	Yes		
Intra-abdominal Infection	7.8	Critical	Yes		
Postoperative Intervention	6.1	Important	No		
Fistula	5.8	Important	No		
Bleeding	5.3	Important	No		
Stoma Complications	4.8	Important	No		
Soft Tissue Infection	3.0	Less important	No		
Incontinence	3.0	Less important	No		
Antibiotic Length of Time	2.3	Less important	No		
Antibiotic Complications	2.3	Less important	No		

TABLE 1: Ranking of Outcomes



TABLE 2. PICO Question 1											
Should primary repair without proximal diversion vs. standard proximal diversion be used for non-destructive penetrating extraperitoneal injuries? Bibliography: 1, 3-19											
Quality assessment						Summary of Findings					
Participant s (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Publicatio n bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relativ e effect (95% Cl)	Anticipated absolute effects	
							With Standar d proxima I diversio n	With Primary repair without proxima I diversio n		Risk with Standar d proxima I diversio n	Risk differenc e with Primary repair without proximal diversio n (95% CI)
mortality		CAL OUTCOME	Ξ)	•	•						
549 (14 observa- tional studies)	serious 1	no serious inconsistency 2	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	9/523 (1.7%)	0/26 (0%)	NA⁴	17 per 1000	17 fewer per 1000
infectious complications (CRITICAL OUTCOME)											
511 (14 observa- tional studies)	serious 1	no serious inconsistency 2	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	43/489 (8.8%)	4/22 (18.2%)	NA⁴	88 per 1000	94 more per 1000

¹ Historical controls only

² Inconsistency could not be adequately assessed

³ Few events; total patients enrolled in the intervention group low.

⁴ No reliable relative comparative effect estimate available due to comparison to historical controls



TABLE 3. PICO Question 2 Should no pre-sacral drainage vs. routine pre-sacral drainage be used for penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries? Bibliography: 1, 3-6, 8-19												
Quality assessment							Summary of Findings					
Participant Risk s of bias (studies) Follow up		tisk Inconsistenc f bias y	Indirectnes s	Imprecisio n	Publicatio n bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relativ e effect (95% Cl)	Anticipated absolute effects		
							With Standar d pre- sacral drainag e	With No pre- sacral drainag e		Risk with Standar d pre- sacral drainag e	Risk differenc e with No pre- sacral drainage (95% CI)	
mortality		CAL OUTCOME)									
653 (17 observa- tional studies)	serious 1	no serious inconsistency 2	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	7/388 (1.8%)	2/265 (0.75%)	NA ⁴	18 per 1000	10 fewer per 1000	
infectious complications (CRITICAL OUTCOME)												
619 (17 observa- tional studies)	serious 1	no serious inconsistency 2	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	36/388 (9.3%)	14/231 (6.1%)	NA ⁴	93 per 1000	32 fewer per 1000	

¹ Historical controls only

² Inconsistency could not be adequately assessed

³ Few events; total sample size not sufficiently high

⁴ No reliable relative comparative effect estimate available due to comparison to historical controls



TABLE 4. PICO Question 3											
Should no distal rectal washout vs. standard distal rectal washout be used for penetrating extraperitoneal rectal injuries? Bibliography: 1, 5-12, 14-17											
Quality assessment						Summary of Findings					
Participant s (studies) Follow up	Risk of bias	s <mark>Inconsistenc</mark> Indirectnes Imprecisio P s y s n n		Publicatio n bias	Overall quality of evidence	Study event rates (%)		Relativ e effect (95% CI)	Anticipated absolute effects		
							With Standar d distal rectal washou t	With No distal rectal washou t	1	Risk with Standar d distal rectal washou t	Risk differenc e with No distal rectal washout (95% CI)
mortality		CAL OUTCOME	E)		I	I	1				
487 (13 observa- tional studies)	serious 1	no serious inconsistency 2	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	2/200 (1%)	4/287 (1.4%)	NA⁴	10 per 1000	4 more per 1000
infectious complications (CRITICAL OUTCOME)											
452 (13 observa- tional studies)	serious 1	no serious inconsistency 2	no serious indirectness	serious ³	undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW ^{1,2,3} due to risk of bias, imprecisio n	20/182 (11%)	31/270 (11.5%)	NA ⁴	110 per 1000	5 more per 1000

¹ Historical controls only

² Inconsistency could not be adequately assessed

³ Few events; total sample size not high.

⁴ No reliable relative comparative effect estimate available due to comparison to historical controls.

