Fokuseret spørgsmål 1

Author(s): George J Bugg, Farah Siddiqui, Jim G Thornton

Date: 2014-05-01

Question: Should Early use of intravenous oxytocin be used for slow progress in the first stage of spontaneous labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of

Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]?¹

Settings

Bibliography: Bugg GJ, Siddiqui F, Thornton JG. Oxytocin versus no treatment or delayed treatment for slow progress in the first stage of spontaneous labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

			Quality ass	essment			No of patie	ents		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Early use of intravenous oxytocin	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Serious	neonatal mor	bidity or pe	rinatal death									
2			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	1/235 (0.43%)	1/234 (0.43%)	RR 0.98 (0.06 to 15.57)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 62 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Apgar so	ore less than	seven at f	ive minutes									
5	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁴	serious ²	none	12/610 (2%)	11/590 (1.9%)	RR 1.02 (0.46 to 2.28)	0 more per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 24 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Neonata	intensive ca	re unit adm	ission									
4			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	33/570 (5.8%)	35/570 (6.1%)	RR 0.95 (0.6 to 1.5)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 25 fewer to 31 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
Uterine h	yperstimulat	ion with fet	al heart rate cha	nges necessitat	ing intervention	on .		- !				•
2			no serious inconsistency	serious ⁵	no serious imprecision	none	17/248 (6.9%)	6/224 (2.7%)	RR 2.51 (1.04 to 6.05)	40 more per 1000 (from 1 more to 135 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Instrume	ntal vaginal o	delivery			•	<u>. </u>		-				•
5		no serious risk of bias	serious ⁶	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	132/610 (21.6%)	115/590 (19.5%)	RR 1.17 (0.72 to 1.88)	33 more per 1000 (from 55 fewer to 172 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Caesarea	an section			•		'			, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	,		'
5			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	74/610 (12.1%)	76/590 (12.9%)	RR 0.88 (0.66 to 1.19)	15 fewer per 1000 (from 44 fewer to 24 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Emergen	cy caesarear	n section fo	r fetal distress									
3			no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	20/437 (4.6%)	19/472 (4%)	RR 1.08 (0.59 to 2)	3 more per 1000 (from 17 fewer to 40 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Woman ı	not satisfied ((scale) (Bet	ter indicated by I	ower values)				•		·		
1	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	145	136	-	MD 3 higher (3.33 lower to 9.33	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

		ı			1					higher)		I
				ļ		ļ		ļ		higher)		
Woman n	ot satisfied	number of	women with neg	ative memories	of childbirth)							
	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	100/233 (42.9%)	86/209 (41.1%)	RR 1.04 (0.84 to 1.3)	16 more per 1000 (from 66 fewer to 123 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Woman n	not satisfied	(number of	women saying d	epressed by ch	nildbirth experie	ence)						
	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency ²	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	72/233 (30.9%)	69/209 (33%)	RR 0.94 (0.71 to 1.23)	20 fewer per 1000 (from 96 fewer to 76 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Participa [®]	tion (scale) (Better indic	ated by lower va	lues)								
	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	233	209	-	MD 0.06 higher (0.05 lower to 0.17 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Perceive	d safety (sca	le) (Better i	ndicated by lowe	r values)								
	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	233	209	-	MD 0.03 higher (0.08 lower to 0.14 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Postpartu	um haemorrh	nage										
I -	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	54/549 (9.8%)	65/550 (11.8%)		20 fewer per 1000 (from 48 fewer to 18 more)		IMPORTANT
Time from	n randomisa	tion to deliv	very (Better indic	ated by lower v	/alues)			•				_
I -	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ⁶	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	543	540	-	MD 2.2 lower (3.29 to 1.1 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT

<sup>Vi fandt ingen estimater pĥ de kritiske outcomes navlesnors pH, sarnat score, Thompson score og encefalopati

Meget bredt konfidens interval

Manglende blinding kan have fÃ,re til bias

APGAR er ikket et særlig godt surrogat mÃ¥l for morbiditet og mortalitet.

I Hinshaw2008 fik alle kvinder amniotomi og "delayed" gruppen skulle afvente op til 8 timer. Et sådan regime vil i Danmark være i strid med andre guidelines. Skal afklares ved nærlæsning af artiklen

I N2 stÃ,rre end 50</sup>

Fokuseret spørgsmål 4

Author(s): Sara Kenyon, Hironobu Tokumasu, Therese Dowswell, Debbie Pledge, Rintaro Mori

Date: 2014-05-21

Question: High versus low dose of oxytocin (all women) for augmentation of delayed labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013,

Issue ".]
Settings:

Bibliography: Kenyon S, Tokumasu H, Dowswell T, Pledge D, Mori R. High-dose versus low-dose oxytocin for augmentation of delayed labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

			Quality asse	essment			No of patier	nts		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	High versus low dose of oxytocin (all women)	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Neonata	l mortality											
3	randomised trials					none	0/301 (0%)	0/303 (0%)	not pooled	not pooled		CRITICAL
Apgar so	ore less than 7	at 5 minut	es	•	•	•						
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ¹	very serious ²	none	0/220 (0%)	1/224 (0.45%)	RR 0.37 (0.02 to 8.5)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 33 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Umbilica	l cord (artery)	pH (Better i	ndicated by lowe	•								
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ³	no serious imprecision	none	66	68	1	MD 0 higher (0.03 lower to 0.03 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Neonata	admission to	special care	baby units									
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ⁴	no serious indirectness	serious⁵	none	8/201 (4%)	16/203 (7.9%)	RR 0.5 (0.22 to 1.15)	39 fewer per 1000 (from 61 fewer to 12 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Caesarea	an section						l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e	L	,	,		
4	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ⁴	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	43/320 (13.4%)	71/324 (21.9%)		83 fewer per 1000 (from 31 fewer to 123 fewer)		IMPORTANT
Instrume	ntal vaginal bi	rth										
3	no methodology chosen					none	53/220 (24.1%)	65/224 (29%)		49 fewer per 1000 (from 113 fewer to 38 more)		IMPORTANT
Subgrou	p analysis: Ca	esarean sec	tion by parity	•		•						
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias		no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision ⁵	none	38/220 (17.3%)	62/224 (27.7%)	RR 0.64 (0.44 to 0.91)	100 fewer per 1000 (from 25 fewer to 155 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Subgrou	p analysis: Ca	esarean sec	tion by parity - N	Nulliparous wor								
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious⁵	none	30/138 (21.7%)	48/162 (29.6%)		86 fewer per 1000 (from 157 fewer to		IMPORTANT

		1		1				1	4.00\	40)		
									1.06)	18 more)		
Subgrou	ıp analysis: Cae	esarean sec	tion by parity -	Multiparous wo	omen							
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	8/82 (9.8%)	14/62 (22.6%)	RR 0.43 (0.19 to 0.97)	129 fewer per 1000 (from 7 fewer to 183 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Length of	of labour (hour;	oxytocin to	delivery) (Bett	er indicated by	lower values)							
1	randomised trials	serious ⁶	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	19	21	-	MD 3.5 lower (6.38 to 0.62 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Length o	of labour (minut	e; onset of	first stage to de	elivery) (Better	indicated by lov	ver values)		•		•		
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	46	46	-	MD 26 lower (128.06 lower to 76.06 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Incidend	e of postpartur	n haemorrh	age		•	•		•		•		
1	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁵	none	21/47 (44.7%)	22/47 (46.8%)	RR 0.95 (0.61 to 1.48)	23 fewer per 1000 (from 183 fewer to 225 more)	0000	IMPORTANT
Diagnos	is of chorioamr	nionitis				•	•			•		
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ⁵	none	25/201 (12.4%)	36/203 (17.7%)	RR 0.7 (0.44 to 1.12)	53 fewer per 1000 (from 99 fewer to 21 more)	0000	IMPORTANT
Incidend	e of hyperstime	ulation										
4	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious⁵	none	34/320 (10.6%)	21/324 (6.5%)	RR 1.47 (0.73 to 2.94)	30 more per 1000 (from 18 fewer to 126 more)	0000	IMPORTANT

Fokuseret spørgsmål 7

Author(s): Feroza Dawood, Therese Dowswell, Siobhan Quenby

Date: 2014-05-08

Question: Should Intravenous fluids + oral intake be used for reducing the duration of labour in low risk nulliparous women [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]?1

Bibliography: Dawood F, Dowswell T, Quenby S. Intravenous fluids for reducing the duration of labour in low risk nulliparous women [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

	Quality assessment							nts		Effect	Quality	
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Intravenous fluids + oral intake	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Mean du	ration of labo	ur (Better i	ndicated by lowe	er values)								
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency		no serious imprecision	none	150	91	-	MD 28.86 lower (47.41 to 10.3 lower)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	IMPORTANT
Caesarea	an section											
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	36/186 (19.4%)	38/129 (29.5%)	RR 0.73 (0.49 to 1.08)	80 fewer per 1000 (from 150 fewer to 24 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
Admissio	on to neonata	l unit										
		no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	serious ³	very serious ²	none	1/96 (1%)	2/99 (2%)	RR 0.52 (0.05 to 5.59)	10 fewer per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 93 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Oxytocin	augmentatio	n			•	,		•				
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	serious ⁴	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	88/284 (31%)	53/129 (41.1%)	RR 0.69 (0.42 to 1.14)	127 fewer per 1000 (from 238 fewer to 58 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT

De kritiske outcomes neontal dÃ,d, apgar <7 efter 5 min, navlesnors ph <7, sarnat score, thompsons score og encephalopi var ikke rapporteret.

IndlĦggelse pÄ¥ neonatal afdeling er et surrogat for neonatal morbiditet og mortalitet
 I^2>50% er forsĸgt hÄ¥ndteret med randoms effect model

Fokuseret spørgsmål 10.1

Author(s): Rebecca MD Smyth, Carolyn Markham, Therese Dowswell

Date: 2014-05-15

Question: Amniotomy versus no amniotomy for shortening spontaneous labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]

Settings:

Bibliography: Smyth RMD, Markham C, Dowswell T. Amniotomy for shortening spontaneous labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

			Quality ass	essment			No of patie	ents		Effect		
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Amniotomy versus no amniotomy	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Length o	of first stage of	of labour (B	etter indicated b	y lower values)								
5	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	very serious ¹	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	578	549	1	MD 20.43 lower (95.93 lower to 55.06 higher)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Length of	of first stage	of labour - F	Primiparous won	nen (Better indi	cated by lower	values)						
4	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	very serious ¹	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	190	189	-	MD 57.93 lower (152.66 lower to 36.8 higher)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Length o	of first stage	of labour - N	Multiparous wom	en (Better indi	cated by lower	values)		•				•
3	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	very serious ¹	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	205	181	-	MD 23.1 higher (50.89 lower to 97.09 higher)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Caesare	an section											
9	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	137/2620 (5.2%)	103/2401 (4.3%)	RR 1.27 (0.99 to 1.63)	12 more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to 27 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Caesare	an section - F	Primiparous	women						,			
6	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	108/1381 (7.8%)	90/1293 (7%)	RR 1.15 (0.88 to 1.51)	10 more per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 35 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Caesare	an section - N	/lultiparous	women									
2	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	12/795 (1.5%)	6/678 (0.88%)	RR 1.76 (0.65 to 4.76)	7 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 33 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Maternal	satisfaction	with childb	irth experience (Better indicate	d by lower valu	ies)		•				
1	trials			no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	43	41	-	MD 1.1 lower (7.15 lower to 4.95 higher)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Apgar so	ore less than	7 at 5 min	utes									
6	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁴	serious ²	none	14/1853 (0.76%)	25/1745 (1.4%)	RR 0.53 (0.28 to 1)	7 fewer per 1000 (from 10 fewer to 0 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL

	randomised	serious ³	no serious	serious4	no serious	none	10/1318	22/1224	RR 0.42	10 fewer per 1000	$\oplus \oplus OO$	CRITICAL
	trials	Serious	inconsistency	Sellous	imprecision	none	(0.76%)			(from 2 fewer to 14 fewer)	LOW	CKITICA
ogar	score less than	n 7 at 5 min	utes - Multipard	us women								
	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	serious ⁴	very serious ²	none	1/266 (0.38%)	1/267 (0.37%)	RR 1 (0.06 to 15.96)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 4 fewer to 56 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	CRITICAL
ength	of second sta	ge (Better i	ndicated by low	er values)	_ !			_!				
U		no serious		no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	968	959	-	MD 1.33 lower (2.92 lower to 0.26 higher)	0000	IMPORTAI
ength	of second sta	ge - Primipa	arous women (E	Better indicated	by lower value	es)				, ,		
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	319	334	-	MD 5.43 lower (9.98 to 0.89 lower)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTAN
ength	of second sta	ge - Multipa	arous women (E	etter indicated	by lower value	s)		•				
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	471	448	-	MD 1.19 lower (2.92 lower to 0.53 higher)	0000	IMPORTAI
xytoo	in augmentation	on		•	•	•	•	<u> </u>				-
	randomised trials	serious ⁴	serious ⁵	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	427/2239 (19.1%)	534/2025 (26.4%)	RR 0.72 (0.54 to 0.96)	74 fewer per 1000 (from 11 fewer to 121 fewer)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTA
xytoc	in augmentation	on - Primipa	arous women				L		,	,		
•	randomised trials		serious ⁵	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	208/583 (35.7%)	255/596 (42.8%)	RR 0.79 (0.56 to 1.11)	90 fewer per 1000 (from 188 fewer to 47 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTA
xytoc	in augmentation	on - Multipa	rous women			1			,	,		
-	randomised trials	serious ³	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	36/266 (13.5%)	85/267 (31.8%)	RR 0.43 (0.3 to 0.6)	181 fewer per 1000 (from 127 fewer to 223 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTAI
latern	al infection											
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	14/1119 (1.3%)	14/1031 (1.4%)	RR 0.88 (0.43 to 1.82)	2 fewer per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 11 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTAI
latern	al infection - P	rimiparous	women			•			,	,		
		no serious		no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	13/853 (1.5%)	14/764 (1.8%)	RR 0.81 (0.38 to 1.72)	3 fewer per 1000 (from 11 fewer to 13 more)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	
latern	al infection - M	lultiparous	women		•		•		,	,		
		no serious		no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	1/266 (0.38%)	0/267 (0%)	RR 3.01 (0.12 to 73.59)	-	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTA

5	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	70/1388 (5%)	61/1298 (4.7%)	RR 1.08 (0.77 to 1.5)		⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
										23 more)		
			unit/neonatal int			women		,				
-	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ²	none	67/1122 (6%)	57/1031 (5.5%)	RR 1.1 (0.78 to		⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	CRITICAL
		L							1.54)	30 more)		
			unit/neonatal int			women			1		1	
	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	3/266 (1.1%)	4/267 (1.5%)	RR 0.75 (0.17 to 3.33)	4 fewer per 1000 (from 12 fewer to 35 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Perinatal	death								31337			
8		no serious	no serious	no serious	very serious ²	none	1/1751	0/1646	RR 3.01	-	⊕⊕00	CRITICAL
	trials		inconsistency	indirectness			(0.06%)	(0%)	(0.12 to 73.59)		LOW	
Perinatal	death - Prim	iparous wo	men								•	
	randomised trials		no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness		none	0/1409 (0%)	0/1324 (0%)	not pooled	not pooled		CRITICAL
Perinatal	death - Mult	iparous wo	men		<u>'</u>	+		<u> </u>	<u> </u>		!	
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	1/308 (0.32%)	0/292 (0%)	RR 3.01 (0.12 to	-	⊕⊕OO LOW	CRITICAL
Soizuroo	(neonate)								73.59)			
	• •	l			2	la a u a	2/2118	0/4054	DD 0 00	0 favor a a 1000	1 0000	IMPORTANT
5	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	(0.09%)	2/1951 (0.1%)	RR 0.88 (0.15 to 5.35)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 4 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Seizures	(neonate) - F	rimiparous	women						<u> </u>		•	
4	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ²	none	2/1318 (0.15%)	2/1227 (0.16%)	RR 0.88 (0.15 to 5.35)	0 fewer per 1000 (from 1 fewer to 7 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	IMPORTANT
Seizures	(neonate) - I	/lultiparous	women							·		
2	randomised trials	no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness		none	0/565 (0%)	0/500 (0%)	not pooled	not pooled		IMPORTANT
								0%		not pooled		
² Bredt ko ³ Mangler ⁴ APGAR	ørre end 80% nfidensinterv nde blinding er ikke en go re end 50%	al	or fetal morbiditet	og mortalitet								

Fokuseret spørgsmål 10.2

Author(s): Rebecca MD Smyth, Carolyn Markham, Therese Dowswell Date: 2014-05-15

Question: No name provided

Settings:

Bibliography: Smyth RMD, Markham C, Dowswell T. Amniotomy for shortening spontaneous labour [Data only. When citing this record quote "Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2013, Issue ".]. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

	Quality assessment						No of pat	tients		Effect	Quality	Importance
No of studies	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Amniotomy	Control	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quanty	importance
Maternal	satisfaction v	with childbir	th experience (Be	etter indicated b	y lower values							
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	no serious imprecision	none	20	19	-	MD 22 higher (2.74 to 41.26 higher)	⊕⊕⊕O MODERATE	IMPORTANT
Apgar sc	ore less than	7 at 5 minu	tes									
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	serious ²	very serious ³	none	1/20 (5%)	0/19 (0%)	RR 2.86 (0.12 to 66.11)	-	⊕OOO VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Oxytocin	augmentatio	n										
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	serious ³	none	11/20 (55%)	12/19 (63.2%)	RR 0.87 (0.52 to 1.47)	82 fewer per 1000 (from 303 fewer to 297 more)	⊕⊕OO LOW	
Caesarea	n section for	fetal distres	SS	•		•		,				
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	none	1/20 (5%)	0/19 (0%)	RR 2.86 (0.12 to 66.11)	-	⊕000 VERY LOW	
Caesarea	n section for	prolonged l	labour									
1	randomised trials	serious ¹	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness	very serious ³	none	1/20 (5%)	2/19 (10.5%)	RR 0.47 (0.05 to 4.82)	56 fewer per 1000 (from 100 fewer to 402 more)	⊕000 VERY LOW	IMPORTANT
Admissio	on to special o	care baby ui	nit/neonatal inten	sive care unit								
1		no serious risk of bias	no serious inconsistency	no serious indirectness		none	0/20 (0%)	0/19 (0%)	not pooled	not pooled		CRITICAL

Ingen blinding
 Apgar ikke et godt surrogat måI for morbiditet og mortalitet
 Bredt konfidensinterval