**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 associationall 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 suspectedstrong associationall plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effectdose 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 associationall 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 associationall plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effectdose response gradient  | 305  | 315  | ⨁⨁⨁⨁HIGH  | Important |
| **Total perioperative blood transfusion** |
| 11  | randomised trials  | serious  | not serious  | not serious  | not serious  | strong associationall plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observeddose response gradient  | 305  | 315  | ⨁⨁⨁⨁HIGH  | Important |
| **Total intraoperative blood loss** |
| 18  | observational studies  | very serious  | not serious  | serious  | very serious  | strong associationall plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observeddose response gradient  | 692  | 693  | ⨁⨁◯◯LOW  | Important |

|  |
| --- |
| **Total perioperative blood transfusion** |
| 18  | observational studies  | very serious  | not serious  | serious  | very serious  | strong associationall plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observeddose 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 associationdose 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 associationall plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effectdose 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 suspectedstrong associationall 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 suspectedstrong associationall plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effectdose 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 suspectedall plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effectdose 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 suspectedall plausible residual confounding would reduce the demonstrated effectdose 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 associationall 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 associationall 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 suspectedstrong associationall 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 suspectedall plausible residual confounding would suggest spurious effect, while no effect was observed  | 81/1199 (6.8%)  | 258/2830 (9.1%)  | ⨁⨁◯◯LOW | Important |