

Appendix Table 6. Summary of Findings - High Volume Compared to Low Volume Flush

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

Outcomes	Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% CI)	№ of participants (studies)	Certainty of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Risk with Low volume flush	Risk with High volume flush				
PIVC failure during dwell	259 per 1,000	428 per 1,000 (200 to 923)	RR 1.65 (0.77 to 3.56)	55 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^a	
Infiltration	185 per 1,000	35 per 1,000 (4 to 287)	RR 0.19 (0.02 to 1.55)	55 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^a	
Dislodgement	0 per 1,000	0 per 1,000 (0 to 0)	RR 6.76 (0.37 to 124.98)	55 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^a	
Occlusion	185 per 1,000	35 per 1,000 (4 to 287)	RR 0.19 (0.02 to 1.55)	55 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^a	
Phlebitis/pain	0 per 1,000	0 per 1,000 (0 to 0)	RR 8.69 (0.49 to 154.06)	55 (1 RCT)	⊕⊕○○ LOW ^a	

*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 2 levels: Imprecision (small sample size and wide confidence interval)