

Appendix Table 5. Summary of Findings - High Frequency Compared to Low Frequency Flush

Patient or population: Pediatrics
Setting: Hospitalized pediatric patients
Intervention: High frequency flush
Comparison: Low frequency flush

Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Risk with Low frequency flush	Risk with High frequency flush				
PIVC failure during dwell	159 per 1,000	117 per 1,000 (75 to 184)	RR 0.74 (0.47 to 1.16)	452 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE a	
Infiltration/Extravasation	44 per 1,000	27 per 1,000 (10 to 74)	RR 0.62 (0.23 to 1.67)	452 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^b	
Phlebitis/pain	62 per 1,000	36 per 1,000 (15 to 84)	RR 0.58 (0.25 to 1.37)	452 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^b	
Occlusion	84 per 1,000	49 per 1,000 (24 to 101)	RR 0.59 (0.29 to 1.21)	452 (2 RCTs)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^b	

*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. Downgraded 1 level: Imprecision (small sample size)

b. Downgraded 2 levels: Imprecision (small sample size and wide confidence interval)