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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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment</th>
<th>№ of patients</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>№ of studies</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Risk of bias</td>
<td>Inconsistency</td>
<td>Indirectness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mortality</td>
<td>randomized trials</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>Very serious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renal Replacement Therapy</td>
<td>randomized trials</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>Very serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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.