

Appendix Table 3. Summary of Findings - Static Ultrasound Guided PIVC Insertion Compared to dynamic Ultrasound Guided PIVC Insertion

Patient or population: pediatrics
Setting: Hospitalized pediatric patients
Intervention: Static ultrasound guided PIVC insertion
Comparison: Dynamic ultrasound guided PIVC insertion

Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Risk with Dynamic ultrasound guided PIVC insertion	Risk with Static ultrasound guided PIVC insertion				
First time insertion success	867 per 1,000	598 per 1,000 (433 to 832)	RR 0.69 (0.50 to 0.96)	60 (1 RCT)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW a,b,c	
Overall insertion success	900 per 1,000	630 per 1,000 (468 to 855)	RR 0.70 (0.52 to 0.95)	60 (1 RCT)	⊕○○○ VERY LOW ^{b,c}	

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High certainty: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low certainty: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

Explanations

- a. Risk of bias due to allocation concealment
- b. Risk of bias due to outcome assessor
- c. Small sample size