**2.4 Question**: Do smokers have a higher risk of non-union/surgical complications after surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient management

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **cessation of smoking** | **no intervention** |
| 3 | observational studies | very serious | serious | serious | very serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | 96/334 (28.7%) | 80/699 (11.4%) | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | Important |

**3.Question**: Prehabilitation compared to standard care for patients undergoing and enhanced recovery pathway in surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient care

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Effect** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **rehabilitation** | **standard care** | **Relative (95% CI)** | **Absolute (95% CI)** |
| **Pain related outcomes, including VAS/NRS (follow up: W\ days)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | randomised trials | serious | not serious | not serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 190 | 188 | - | see comment | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE |  |
| **Patient reported outcomes (PROM's)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | randomised trials | serious | not serious | not serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 218 | 196 | - | see comment | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE |  |

**4.1 Question**: Nutritional screening compared to no screening in patients undergoing spinal surgery

**Setting**: Peri-operative care setting

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | | | **Certainty** | | **Importance** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | | **Study design** | | **Risk of bias** | | **Inconsistency** | | **Indirectness** | | **Imprecision** | | **Other considerations** | | | **nutritional screening** | | **no screening** | |
| **Morbidity composite- anyone of cardiac, pulmonary, renal or surgical** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | observational studies | | serious | | not serious | | serious | | serious | | publication bias strongly suspected strong association all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect dose response gradient | | 222/748 (29.7%) | 767/2040 (37.6%) | | not estimable | |  | | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | |  |
| **Reported Economic Financial Outcomes- including readmission rates** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | observational studies | | serious | | serious | | serious | | serious | | strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | | 778 | 3056 | | - | | **0**  (0 to 0 ) | | ⨁⨁◯◯ LOW | |  |

**5.Question**: Should pre-operative anaemia be managed in patients undergoing surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient care

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** |  | **[comparison]** |
| **Health service related outcome- Length of stay** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | observational studies | very serious | serious | serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 324 | 1223 | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | | Important |

**6. Question**: Intravenous tranexamic acid compared to placebo or no treatment for prevention/management of bleeding during surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative setting

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **intravenous tranexamic acid** | **placebo or no treatment** |
| **Surgical complicationTotal intraoperative blood loss** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | randomised trials | serious | not serious | not serious | not serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect dose response gradient | 305 | 315 | ⨁⨁⨁⨁ HIGH | Important |
| **Total perioperative blood transfusion** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 | randomised trials | serious | not serious | not serious | not serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed dose response gradient | 305 | 315 | ⨁⨁⨁⨁ HIGH | Important |
| **Total intraoperative blood loss** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | observational studies | very serious | not serious | serious | very serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed dose response gradient | 692 | 693 | ⨁⨁◯◯ LOW | Important |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Total perioperative blood transfusion** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 | observational studies | very serious | not serious | serious | very serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed dose response gradient | 692 | 693 | ⨁⨁◯◯ LOW | Important |

**6. Question**: Cell saver use compared to routine care for patients undergoing moderate/ major spine surgery

**Setting**: Peri-operative patient care

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **cell saver** | **routine care** |
| **Perioperative blood transfusion** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | observational studies | very serious | serious | serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 68 | 72 | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | Important |

**8. Question**: Should pre-emptive analgesia with gabapentinoids be used in patients undergoing surgery of the spine?

**Setting**: Perioperative patient care

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **[intervention]** | **[comparison]** |
| **Total opioid consumption-assess in oral morphine equivalents** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | randomized trials | not serious | not serious | not serious | serious | strong association  dose response gradient present | 200 | 208 | ⨁⨁⨁⨁ HIGH | Important | |
| **Visual Analogue Score assessed at 2-24 hours post-operatively** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | randomized trials | not serious | not serious | not serious | serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect dose response gradient | 280 | 285 | ⨁⨁⨁⨁ HIGH | Important |

**10.2 Question**: Intraoperative antibiotic prophylaxis compared to placebo or no treatment for patients undergoing surgery of the spine?

**Setting**: Peri-operative patient management

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | | **Importance** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **intraoperative antibiotic prophylaxis** | **placebo or no treatment** |
| **Surgical complication (infection)** | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | randomised trials | not serious | not serious | serious | not serious | all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | 10/451 (2.2%) | 23/392 (5.9%) | ⨁⨁⨁⨁ HIGH |  | |

**10.2 Question**: Vancomycin powder intra-wound administration compared to standard therapy or placebo for spinal surgery

**Setting**: Peri-operative patient setting

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **vancomycin powder intra-wound administration** | **standard therapy or placebo** |
| **Surgical complication Postoperative infection rate (assessed with: Number of cases with infection)** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 25 | observational studies | very serious | not serious | serious | very serious | all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | 197/8456 (2.3%) | 412/9937 (4.1%) | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | Important |

**11. Question**: Intraoperative would infiltration with local anaesthesia compared to placebo or standard therapy for patients undergoing surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient management

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **intraoperative would infiltration with local anaesthesia** | **placebo or standard therapy** |
| **Visual Analogue Score at any point in time in the first 24 hours post-operatively** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 7 | randomised trials | not serious | serious | not serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | 281 | 248 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | Important |
| **Cumulative morphine consumption in 24 hours** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | randomised trials | not serious | serious | serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | 71 | 55 | ⨁⨁◯◯ LOW | Important |

**12.Question**: Total intravenous anaesthesia compared to volatile inhalation anaesthesia as a maintenance technique in surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient management

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **total intravenous anaesthesia** | **volatile inhalation anaesthesia** |
| **Quality of Recovery Scores/Patient Reported Outcome Measures** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | randomised trials | serious | not serious | not serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 75 | 75 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | Important |

**13. Question**: Minimally invasive surgery compared to standard care for enhanced recovery pathways in surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient management

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **minimally invasive surgery** | **standard care** |
| **Health Service Related outcomes- Length of stay** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 15 | observational studies | serious | not serious | serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 488 | 460 | ⨁⨁◯◯ LOW | Important |
| **Quality of recovery after surgery Time to ambulation** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | observational studies | serious | serious | not serious | not serious | publication bias strongly suspected strong association all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | 130 | 122 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | Important |
| **Cumulative medical and surgical complications** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 22 | observational studies | serious | not serious | serious | serious | publication bias strongly suspected strong association all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect dose response gradient | 90/814 (11.1%) | 117/768 (15.2%) | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | Important |

**16. Question**: Should Intravenous intraoperative ketamine compared to standard treatment/placebo be used for patients undergoing surgery of the spine?

**Setting**: Perioperative care of patients undergoing surgery of the spine

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **intravenous intraoperative ketamine** | **standard treatment** |
| **Pain management outcome- Postoperative opioid consumption** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | randomized trials | not serious | not serious | not serious | very serious | publication bias strongly suspected all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect dose response gradient | 105 | 103 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | IMPORTANT |

**16. Question**: Continuous remifentanil infusion compared to standard therapy or placebo for patients undergoing surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative surgical setting

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **continuous remifentanil infusion** | **standard therapy or placebo** |
| **Perioperative analgesic consumption within 24 hours of surgery** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | randomized trials | very serious | serious | serious | serious | publication bias strongly suspected all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect dose response gradient | 31 | 47 | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | Important |

**16. Question**: Multimodal analgesia compared to standard care for ERSS?

**Setting**: perioperative patient management

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | | | **Other considerations** | **multimodal analgesia** | **standard care** |  | |
| **Postoperative opioid consumption day 0-2;** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | observational studies | extremely serious | not serious | serious | serious | | strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | | 235 | 428 | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | Important | |
| **Length of stay** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 2 | observational studies | extremely serious | serious | serious | serious | strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | | | 94 | 284 | ⨁◯◯◯ VERY LOW | Important | |
| **Postoperative Visual Analogue Scores(VAS) 0-2 days;** | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | randomized trials | serious | serious | not serious | not serious | all plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effect | | | 201 | 200 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | Important | |

**16. Question**: Should intravenous lignocaine infusion be used in patients undergoing surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient setting

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | **Importance** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **[intervention]** | **[comparison]** |
| **Pain management outcomes- Visual Analogue Scale (VAS) scores at 24 hours** | | | | | | | | | | |
| 5 | randomised trials | not serious | not serious | serious | serious | all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 155 | 153 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | Important |

**21.Question**: What is the utility of evidence for early mobilization compared to standard care for patients undergoing surgery of the spine

**Setting**: Perioperative patient care

| **Certainty assessment** | | | | | | | **№ of patients** | | **Certainty** | | | **Importance** | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **№ of studies** | **Study design** | **Risk of bias** | **Inconsistency** | **Indirectness** | **Imprecision** | **Other considerations** | **early mobilization** | **standard care** |
| **Hospital related outcome- Length of stay** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 10 | observational studies | serious | not serious | serious | serious | publication bias strongly suspected strong association all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 5717 | 2408 | ⨁⨁⨁◯ MODERATE | | Important | | |
| **Morbidity outcome -Complication rates** | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 6 | observational studies | serious | not serious | very serious | serious | publication bias strongly suspected all plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed | 81/1199 (6.8%) | 258/2830 (9.1%) | ⨁⨁◯◯ LOW | Important | | |