# **National Clinical Guideline Centre**

**Draft for consultation** 

# **Preoperative tests**

Routine preoperative tests for elective surgery

Clinical guideline <...>

Appendix I: GRADE tables

October 2015

Draft for consultation

Commissioned by the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence











#### Disclaimer

Healthcare professionals are expected to take NICE clinical guidelines fully into account when exercising their clinical judgement. However, the guidance does not override the responsibility of healthcare professionals to make decisions appropriate to the circumstances of each patient, in consultation with the patient and, where appropriate, their guardian or carer.

#### Copyright

National Clinical Guideline Centre, 2015

#### **Funding**

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

# **Contents**

Appendix I: GRADE tables ......5

# **Appendix I: GRADE tables**

# I.1 Resting electrocardiogram

#### I.1.1 Non-cardiac, non-vascular surgery

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Relative effect with 95% CIs	
Normal elec	trocardiogram v	ersus prolonged C	Tc interval for predic	ting perioperative c	ardiovascular event	(adjusted ORs) [adu	ults aged > 18 years]	
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency			None	Adjusted OR[95% CI]: 1.04 [1.03, 1.06]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias

#### I.1.2 Elective surgery

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality					
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Relative effect with 95% CIs						
	Normal electrocardiogram versus abnormal electrocardiogram for predicting postoperative complications including cardiac, cerebrovascular, respiratory and bleeding (adjusted ORs)												
1	1 Cohort study Serious <sup>a</sup> No inc			No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR[95% CI]: 2.81 [1.36, 5.82]	LOW					

National Clinical Guideline Centre, 2015

Quality assessment	Adjusted effects	Quality					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias

#### I.1.3 Hip fracture surgery

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality				
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Relative effect with 95% CIs					
Normal elec	trocardiogram ve	ersus abnormal el	ectrocardiogram for p	oredicting one year	mortality(adjusted I	RRs) [adults mean ag	ge 81 years]					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted RR[95% CI]: 1.54 [0.95, 2.49]	VERY LOW				
Normal elec	Normal electrocardiogram versus abnormal electrocardiogram for predicting survival rate(adjusted HRs)											
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR[95% CI]: 2.66 [1.54, 4.59]	LOW				

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias b Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### I.1.4 Major vascular surgery

Quality asses	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Relative effect with 95% CIs	

Quality ass	sessment	Adjusted effects	Quality					
Normal ele	ectrocardiogram v							
1	Cohort study	No serious risk of bias	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR[95% CI]: 1.94 [1.48, 2.54]	HIGH

#### I.1.5 Non-cardiac surgery

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality		
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Relative effect with 95% CIs			
Normal electrocardiogram versus abnormal electrocardiogram for predicting postoperative cardiac complications (adjusted ORs)										
1	Cohort study Serious risk of bias <sup>a</sup> No serious No serious Very serious risk of imprecision <sup>b</sup> None Adjusted OR[95% CI]: 0.63 [0.28, 1.42]									
Normal elec	trocardiogram v	ersus left bundle l	oranch block for pred	icting postoperative	e myocardial infarcti	on (adjusted ORs)				
1	Cohort study	Very serious risk of bias <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious risk of imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR[95% CI]: 3.1 [1.00, 9.61]	MODERATE		
Normal elec	trocardiogram v	ersus right bundle	branch block for pre	dicting postoperativ	ve myocardial infarc	tion (adjusted ORs)				
1	Cohort study	Very serious risk of bias <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious risk of imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR[95% CI]: 2.1 [1.00, 4.41]	LOW		
Normal elec	trocardiogram v	ersus left bundle l	oranch block for pred	icting death during	admission (adjusted	ORs)				
1	Cohort study	Very serious risk of bias <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious risk of imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR[95% CI]: 3.5 [1.3, 9.42]	VERY LOW		

Quality ass	essment	Adjusted effects	Quality					

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

### I.2 Resting echocardiogram

#### 1.2.1

Quality	Quality assessment						Number of patier	Effect				
N° of studi es	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecisi on	Other	After implementation	Prior to recommendat ions	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importance
Delay ii	n surgery											
1	Observ ational studies	Very serio us <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	None	10/38 (26.3%)	3/22 (13.6%)	RR 1.93 (0.59 to 6.27)	more per 1000 (from 56 fewer to 719 more)	VERY LOW	IMPORTANT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias <sup>b</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs

#### 1.2.2

Quality	assessment						Number of patients Effect			fect		
N° of studie s	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Preoperative resting echo	No echocardio graphy (non- cardiac surgery)	Relative (95% CI)	Absolu te	Quality	Importa nce
30-day r	nortality											
1	Observationa I studies	Serious a	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	693/35498 (2%)	609/35498 (1.7%)	RR 1.14 (1.02 to 1.27)	2 more per 1000 (from 0 more to 5 more)	VERY LOW	CRITICAL
Length o	of hospital stay (b	etter indic	cated by lower val	ues)								
1	Observationa I studies	Serious a	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	35498	35498	-	MD 0.31 higher (0.17 to 0.45 higher)	VERY LOW	IMPORT ANT
Surgical	site infection											
1	Observationa I studies	Serious a	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	4690/35498 (13.2%)	4570/3549 8 (12.9%)	RR 1.03 (0.98 to 1.08)	4 more per 1000 (from 3 fewer to 10 more)	VERY LOW	IMPORT ANT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias. <sup>b</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs

#### I.2.3 Laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass surgery

Quality	assessment					Number of patient	Effect					
N° of studie s	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistenc y	Indirectness	Imprecisi on	Other	Preoperative resting echocardiograph y	No echocardiog raphy	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importanc e
Length o	of hospital sta	У										
1	Observati onal studies	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistenc y	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	26/46 (56.5%)	20/46 (43.5%)	-	MD 0.7 higher (0.13 lower to 1.53 higher)	VERY LOW	IMPORTA NT

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.
<sup>b</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs

# **Cardiopulmonary exercise testing (CPET)**

#### 1.3.1 Intervention review

#### **Open AAA surgery** 1.3.1.1

c	Quality a	assessment						Number of pati	ents	Effect			
	l° of tudie	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Preoperative CPET	No CPET	Relativ e (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importa nce

Quality	uality assessment							Number of patients Effect				
N° of studie s	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Preoperative CPET	No CPET	Relativ e (95% CI)	Absolute	Quality	Importa nce
30 day n	nortality											
1	Observationa I studies	Very serious	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	188	128	RR 0.32 (0.11 to 0.94)	86 fewer per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 112	VERY LOW	CRITICAL

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias

#### I.3.1.2 EVAR AAA surgery

Quality a	ality assessment							Number of patients Effect				
N° of studie s	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Preoperative CPET	No CPET	Relativ e (95% CI)	Absolute	Qualit y	Importa nce
30 day n	nortality											
1	Observationa I studies	Very serious	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Very serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	188	128	Peto OR 3.91 (0.05 to	more per 1000 (from 0 fewer to	VERY LOW	CRITICA L

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MIDs

Quality	uality assessment							Number of patients				
N° of studie s	Design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Preoperative CPET	No CPET	Relativ e (95% CI)	Absolute	Qualit y	Importa nce
1 _									329.71	77 more)		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias. <sup>2</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MID

#### **Prognostic review** 1.3.2

#### Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) repair surgery - aerobic threshold 1.3.2.1

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
30-day mor	tality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 6.35 [1.84-21.92]	LOW
35-month s	urvival							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 0.84 [0.73,0.96]	LOW
Cardiac con	nplications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.55 [0.37, 0.84]	LOW

Quality ass	sessment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Respiratory	y complications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: =0.85 [0.62, 1.17]	VERY LOW
All complic	ations							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: =0.71 [0.57, 0.88]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias b Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) repair surgery - VE/VO<sub>2</sub> 1.3.2.2

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
90-day mor	tality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 8.59 [2.33, 31.67]	VERY LOW
3 year survi	val							
1	Cohort study	serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 1.63 [1.01-2.63]	MODERATE
Cardiac com	plications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.03 [0.81, 1.31]	VERY LOW

Quality ass	sessment	Adjusted effects	Quality					
Pulmonary	complications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.89 [0.69, 1.15]	VERY LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias <sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### 1.3.2.3 Abdominal aortic aneurysm (AAA) repair surgery – VE/VCO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Survival at 3	35 months							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision.	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 1.13 [1.07, 1.20]	LOW
Survival at 3	3 years							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 1.63 [1.01-2.63]	MODERATE
Cardiac con	nplications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]:0.96 [0.86-1.09]	VERY LOW
Respiratory	complications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.18 [1.05-1.33]	LOW

<sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### 1.3.2.4 Lung resection surgery - VO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Complicatio	ns							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.87 [0.76,0.99]	LOW
Complicatio	ns							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.84 [0.75, 0.94]	LOW
Cardiovascu	lar complication	S						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.80 [0.68, 0.92]	LOW
All complica	tions							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 0.79 [0.71-0.88]	LOW
Cardiopulmo	onary complicati	ons						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 0.05 [0.01- 0.25]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### 1.3.2.5 Lung resection surgery – VE/CO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Respiratory	complications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.09 [1.03, 1.16]	LOW
30-day mort	ality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.24 [1.06, 1.45]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.3.2.6 Colorectal surgery – VO<sub>2</sub>

Any compli	cation							
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	Number of studies
Any compli	cation							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.60 [0.45, 0.80]	LOW
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.77 [0.66, 0.90]	LOW

<sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.3.2.7 Pancreaticoduodenectomy – anaerobic threshold

Number of Study studies design Risk of bias Inconsistency Indirectness Imprecision Other consistency include include include the consistency includes the consistency in the consisten	Effect with 95% CIs rations,
·	g cion bias possible
In-hospital mortality – (Ausania 2012)	
Cohort study  Very serious  No serious  inconsistency  No serious  indirectness  Serious  imprecision  None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: VERY LOW 1.32 [0.14, 12.43]
In-hospital mortality – (Junejo 2014)	
Cohort study Very serious No serious No serious Serious None inconsistency indirectness imprecision None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: VERY LOW 0.90 [0.52-1.56]
Cardiorespiratory complications	
Cohort study Very serious No serious No serious Serious None inconsistency indirectness imprecision None	Adjusted OR [95% VERY LOW CI]:2.88 [0.6, 12.64]
Cardiopulmonary complications	
Cohort study Very serious No serious No serious Serious None inconsistency indirectness imprecision None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: VERY LOW 1.05 [0.82, 1.34]
All complications - (Ausania 2012)	
Cohort study Very serious No serious No serious Serious None inconsistency indirectness imprecision None	Adjusted OR [95% LOW CI]:3.73 [1.33, 10.51]
All complication – (Junejo 2014)	

18

Quality ass	essment	Adjusted effects	Quality					
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]:1.07 [0.83, 1.38]	VERY LOW
Pancreatic	leak							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]:5.79 [1.62, 20.69]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### Pancreaticoduodenectomy - VO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
In-hospital r	nortality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.03 [0.77-1.38]	VERY LOW
30-day mor	tality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.32 [0.91-1.91]	VERY LOW
All complica	tions							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]:1.00 [0.86-1.16]	VERY LOW

<sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null lin

# National Clinical Guideline Centre, 2015 1.3.2.9 Pancreaticoduodenectomy - VE/VCO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
30-day mort	ality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.35 [1.03, 1.77]	LOW
In hospital n	nortality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.26 [1.05, 1.51]	LOW
All complica	tions							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.97[0.89, 1.06]	VERY LOW
Cardiopulm	onary complicati	ons						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.00 [0.86, 1.16]	VERY LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### Other surgery types - anaerobic threshold 1.3.2.10

Quality assessment Adjusted effect	s Quality
------------------------------------	-----------

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Complication	ons							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 0.74 [0.57, 0.96]	LOW
Complicatio	ons							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR[95% CI]0.44 [0.30, 0.64]	MODERATE
Length of h	ospital stay							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR [95% CI]: 0.47 [0.28-0.80]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias b Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### I.3.2.11 Other surgery types – VO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Complicatio	ns – Peak VO <sub>2</sub> <1	.5.8mL/kg/min						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 12.89 [1.14-145.76]	LOW

Quality ass	sessment	Adjusted effects	Quality					
Complications – continuous								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 1.61 [1.19, 2.18]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### .3.2.12 Other surgery types – VE/VCO<sub>2</sub>

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Any complic	ations							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 3.97 [1.44-10.95]	LOW
Cardiopulmo	onary complication	ons						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR [95% CI]: 3.45 [1.3-9.09]	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

# Polysomnography

#### I.4.1 Intervention evidence

#### Elective procedures in general surgery, gynaecology, orthopaedics, urology, plastic surgery, ophthalmology and neurosurgery

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Respiratory	complications							
1	Intervention	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious indirectness <sup>b</sup>	Very serious <sup>c</sup>	None	RR 1.43 (0.96 to 2.06)	VERY LOW
Cardiac con	nplications							
1	Intervention	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious indirectness <sup>b</sup>	Very serious <sup>c</sup>	None	RR 1.94 (0.74 to 5.08)	VERY LOW
Neurologic	complications							
1	Intervention	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious indirectness <sup>b</sup>	Very serious <sup>c</sup>	None	RR 0.65 (0.11 to 3.84)	VERY LOW
Unplanned	ICU admission							
1	Intervention	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious indirectness <sup>b</sup>	Very serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 3.26 (0.56 to 19)	VERY LOW
Readmissio	n within 30 days							
1	Intervention	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious indirectness <sup>b</sup>	Very serious <sup>c</sup>	None	RR 0.78 (0.21 to 2.85)	VERY LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.
<sup>b</sup> Downgraded as evidence contained patients undergoing neurosurgery

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the confidence interval crossed 1 MID or by 2 increments if the confidence interval crossed both MID

#### **Prognostic evidence**

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Qual		
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs			
Post-operative pulmonary complications										
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 1.00 (0.44 to 2.27)	LOW		
Surgical cor	mplications									
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 1.33 (0.79 to 2.24)	LOW		
Other post-	operative compl	ications								
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 0.79 (0.49 to 1.27)	LOW		
All post-ope	erative complicat									
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 0.86 (0.59 to 1.25)	LOW		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias bias imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

### I.5 Health technology assessment – pulmonary function tests, full blood count and kidney function tests

#### I.5.1 Pulmonary function tests

#### I.5.1.1 Bariatric surgery

Quality asso	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
All postoper	tive complications	s – test: vital capaci	ty (predictive value per	10% decrease in vital	capacity)			
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted RR 2.29 (2.2 to 2.38)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.5.1.2 Gastric cancer surgery – abnormal pulmonary function tests (defined based on FEV<sub>1</sub>/FVC ratios and FEV<sub>1</sub> values)

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Surgical post	operative complica	ations						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.75 (1.03 to 2.97)	LOW
Systemic pos	toperative complic	ations						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.11 (0.32 to 3.85)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### **Full blood count**

# National Clinical Guideline Centre, 2015 JAII elective surgeries - anaemia

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Mortality -	All anaemic patie	nts						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 2.36 (1.57 to 3.55)	MODERATE
Mortality -	Excluding patient	s with severe ana	emia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.79 (1.17 to 2.74)	MODERATE
Mortality -	Excluding those w	ho received RBC	transfusions					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 3.04 (1.8 to 5.13)	MODERATE

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### Orthopaedic surgery – anaemia 1.5.2.2

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
RBC transfu	usion							
1	Cohort study	No serious risk of bias	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 4.7 (3.8 to 5.81)	MODERATE

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality	
Allogenic b	lood transfusion -	total hip arthrop	lasty						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 2.03 (1.86-2.22)	LOW	
Allogenic b	lood transfusion	total knee arthr	oplasty						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 2.70 (2.52-2.91)	LOW	
Increased length of stay >5 days									
1	Cohort study	No serious risk of bias	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 2.5 (1.9 to 3.29)	MODERATE	
Readmission within 90 days									
1	Cohort study	No serious risk of bias	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.4 (1.1 to 1.78)	MODERATE	
Periprosetl	netic joint infectio	ns							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.95 (1.41 to 2.7)	LOW	
Mortality -	30 day mortality								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 0.59 (0.1 to 3.53)	VERY LOW	
Mortality -	90 day mortality								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 1.54 (0.5 to 4.73)	VERY LOW	
Mortality -	1 year mortality								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.81 (1 to 3.29)	LOW	
Hyperglyca	emia								
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 3.9 (0.91-17)	LOW	

Severe hyp	erglycaemia							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 2.0 (0.5-8.1)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Sample includes different ages and ASA status

#### Vascular surgery – anaemia and white blood cell count

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality		
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs			
Anaemia: Major adverse cardiac event – Mild anaemia										
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 1.8 (0.8 to 4.05)	LOW		
Anaemia: N	Anaemia: Major adverse cardiac event – Moderate anaemia									
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 2.3 (1.1 to 4.81)	MODERATE		
Anaemia: N	Aajor adverse card	diac event – Sever	e anaemia							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 4.7 (2.6 to 8.5)	MODERATE		
WBC: Comp	olications – Endov	ascular cohort								
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.32 (1.11 to 1.58)	MODERATE		
WBC: Comp	WBC: Complications – Open cohort									
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious	No serious	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 0.97 (0.86 to 1.08)	LOW		

b Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias c Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality	
			inconsistency	indirectness					
WBC: Majo	r adverse events -	- Endovascular co	hort						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.67 (1.23 to 2.27)	MODERATE	
WBC: Major adverse events – Open cohort									
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Adjusted OR 1.07 (0.98 to 1.17)	LOW	
WBC: Death	n – Endovascular d	cohort							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.82 (1.12 to 2.96)	MODERATE	
WBC: Death – Open cohort									
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted OR 1.17 (1.05 to 1.3)	MODERATE	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias, and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias <sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### 1.5.2.4 Cancer surgery – white blood cell count

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality		
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs			
Cancer-spec	cific survival – WB	C ≤9.5 versus >9.	5							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR 1.91 (1.1 to 3.32)	VERY LOW		
Cancer-spec	Cancer-specific survival – WBC ≤10.0 versus >10.0									
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	Adjusted HR 1.56 (0.86 to 2.83)	VERY LOW		

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
			inconsistency					
Cancer-spe	cific survival – WB							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR 1.97 (1 to 3.88)	VERY LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.5.2.5 Cancer surgery – platelet count

Quality ass	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Overall sur	vival – Platelet co	unt ≤178 versus >	178					
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	Adjusted HR 1.54 (1.04 to 2.29)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.5.2.6 Non-cardiac surgery – platelet count

Quality asso	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Blood transf	usion - Moderate-to	severe thrombocy	rtopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.76 (1.49 to 2.08)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Indirect outcome: cancer-specific (rather than all-cause) mortality

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>c</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

Quality a	ssessment						Adjusted effects	Quality	
Blood tran	sfusion - Mild throm	bocytopenia							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.28 (1.18 to 1.39)	LOW	
Blood tran	sfusion - Low-norma	al thrombocytopenia	a						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.01 (0.96 to 1.06)	VERY LOW	
Blood tran	Blood transfusion - Thrombocytosis								
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.44 (1.3 to 1.6)	LOW	
Mortality - Moderate-to-severe thrombocytopenia									
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>d</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.93 (1.43 to 2.6)	VERY LOW	
Mortality -	Mild thrombocytope	nia							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.31 (1.11 to 1.55)	LOW	
Mortality -	Low-normal thrombo	ocytopenia							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.91 (0.8 to 1.04)	VERY LOW	
Mortality -	Thrombocytosis								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>d</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.94 (0.72 to 1.23)	VERY LOW	
Mortality of	or major complication	n - Moderate-to-seve	ere thrombocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.52 (1.32 to 1.75)	LOW	
Mortality of	or major complication	n - Mild thrombocyte	openia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.12 (1.04 to 1.21)	LOW	

Quality a	ssessment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Mortality	or major complication	- Low-normal thro	mbocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1 (0.96 to 1.04)	VERY LOW
Mortality	or major complication	n – Thrombocytosis						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.36 (1.25 to 1.48)	LOW
Cardiac c	omplication - Modera	te-to-severe thromb	ocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.02 (0.67 to 1.55)	VERY LOW
Cardiac c	omplication - Mild thr	ombocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.99 (0.81 to 1.21)	VERY LOW
Cardiac c	omplication - Low-no	rmal thrombocytope	enia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.08 (0.95 to 1.23)	VERY LOW
Cardiac c	omplication – Thromb	oocytosis						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.13 (0.84 to 1.52)	VERY LOW
Pulmonar	y complication - Mod	erate-to-severe thro	mbocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.87 (1.5 to 2.33)	LOW
Pulmonar	y complication - Mild	thrombocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.08 (0.95 to 1.23)	VERY LOW
Pulmonar	y complication - Low-	normal thrombocyt	openia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.06 (0.99 to 1.14)	VERY LOW

Quality as	sessment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Pulmonary	complication - Thro	ombocytosis						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.3 (1.12 to 1.51)	LOW
Renal com	plication - Moderate-	to-severe thromboo	ytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 2.05 (1.48 to 2.84)	LOW
Renal com	plication - Mild thron	nbocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.45 (1.2 to 1.75)	LOW
Renal com	plication - Low-norm	al thrombocytopen	ia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.06 (0.92 to 1.22)	VERY LOW
Renal com	plication – Thrombo	cytosis						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.48 (1.14 to 1.92)	LOW
CNS comp	lication - Moderate-te	o-severe thrombocy	rtopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.73 (0.34 to 1.57)	VERY LOW
CNS comp	lication - Mild throm	bocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.13 (0.85 to 1.5)	VERY LOW
CNS comp	lication - Low-norma	l thrombocytopenia	ı					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.01 (0.83 to 1.23)	VERY LOW
CNS comp	lication - Thromboc	ytosis						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.09 (0.69 to 1.72)	VERY LOW

Quality a	assessment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Sepsis co	omplication - Moderate	e-to-severe thrombo	ocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.17 (0.92 to 1.49)	VERY LOW
Sepsis co	omplication - Mild thro	mbocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1 (0.89 to 1.12)	VERY LOW
Sepsis co	omplication - Low-nor	mal thrombocytope	nia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.95 (0.88 to 1.03)	VERY LOW
Sepsis co	omplication – Thrombo	ocytosis						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.27 (1.12 to 1.44)	LOW
Wound c	omplication - Moderat	e-to-severe thromb	ocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.24 (0.97 to 1.59)	VERY LOW
Wound c	omplication - Mild thro	ombocytopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.11 (0.98 to 1.26)	VERY LOW
Wound c	omplication - Low-nor	mal thrombocytope	nia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 0.94 (0.88 to 1)	LOW
Wound c	omplication – Thromb	ocytosis						
	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.49 (1.31 to 1.69)	LOW
Thrombo	embolic complication	- Moderate-to-seve	re thrombocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.08 (0.74 to 1.58)	VERY LOW

Quality a	assessment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Thrombo	embolic complication	- Mild thromboo	ytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.09 (0.9 to 1.32)	VERY LOW
Thrombo	embolic complication	- Low-normal th	rombocytopenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.04 (0.93 to 1.16)	VERY LOW
Thrombo	embolic complication	- Thrombocytos	sis					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.74 (1.43 to 2.12)	LOW
Graft failu	ure - Moderate-to-seve	ere thrombocyto	oenia					
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.09 (0.55 to 2.16)	VERY LOW
Graft failu	ure - Mild thrombocyto	openia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.81 (0.56 to 1.17)	VERY LOW
Graft failu	ure - Low-normal thro	mbocvtopenia						
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 0.87 (0.7 to 1.08)	VERY LOW
Graft failu	ure – Thrombocytosis							
1	Cohort study	Serious <sup>e</sup>	No serious inconsistency	Serious <sup>b</sup>	Serious <sup>c</sup>	None	OR 1.31 (0.91 to 1.89)	VERY LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Sample includes ASA status I-V patients but results are not stratified <sup>c</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### I.5.3 Kidney function tests (urea and electrolytes)

#### I.5.3.1 Vascular surgery – eGFR

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Postoperativ	e mortality or strol	(e						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	OR 3.7 (1.3 to 10.53)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.5.3.2 Endovascular repair of abdominal aortic aneurysm – eGFR

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs	
Postoperative	mortality							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	RR 0.25 (0.03 to 2.32)	VERY LOW
Postoperative	renal failure							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious <sup>b</sup>	None	OR 0.07 (0.03 to 0.21)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

# Non-cardiac surgery - eGFR **I.5.3.3**National Clinical Guideline Centre, 2015

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs, compared with stage 1	
Peri- or post	operative mortality	1						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Stage 2: 0.8 (0.3-1.8) Stage 3a: 2.2 (0.9-5.4) Stage 3b: 2.8 (0.9-8.5) Stage 4: 11.3 (4.3-29.9) Stage 5: 5.8 (1.5-21.9)	VERY LOW
Peri- or post	-operative MAAC	E						
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious <sup>b</sup>	None	Stage 2: 1.5 (0.9-2.5) Stage 3a: 1.8 (0.9-3.5) Stage 3b: 3.9 (0.9-8.0) Stage 4: 4.8 (1.9-11.8) Stage 5: 3.9 (1.3-12.0)	VERY LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

# Glycated haemoglobin test

#### 1.6.1 **Diagnosed diabetes**

#### Primary arteriovenous fistula failure 1.6.1.1

Quality asses	Quality assessment							Quality
Number of	Study	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Effect with 95% CIs	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
studies	design					considerations, including publication bias where possible		
Postoperativ	e complications							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	OR 2.78 (1.30, 5.94)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.6.1.2 Hip/joint arthroplasty

Quality asse	ssment						Adjusted effects	Quality	
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs		
Periprothetic	joint infection								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious	None	OR 0.86 (0.68, 1.09)	VERY LOW	
Death	Death								
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.30 (1.08, 1.56)	LOW	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.6.1.3 Non-cardiac surgery

Quality asse	Quality assessment							Quality
Number of	Study	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other	Effect with 95% CIs	

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

Quality asse	essment						Adjusted effects	Quality
studies	design					considerations, including publication bias where possible		
Periprothetic	joint infection							
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious	None	OR 2.13 (1.23, 3.69)	LOW

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

#### I.6.1.4 Joint arthroplasty

Quality asse	ssment	Adjusted effects	Quality							
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs			
90 Day mortality										
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious	None	OR 1.37 (0.82, 2.29)	VERY LOW		
Number of complications										
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.18 (0.97, 1.44)	VERY LOW		
All complications										
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	OR 1.22 (1.01, 1.47)	VERY LOW		

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line

#### I.6.2 Undiagnosed diabetes

Quality asse	ssment	Adjusted effects	Quality								
Number of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations, including publication bias where possible	Effect with 95% CIs				
Periprothetic joint infection											
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	No serious imprecision	None	OR 2.51 (1.07, 5.90)	LOW			
Death											
1	Cohort study	Very serious <sup>a</sup>	No serious inconsistency	No serious indirectness	Serious imprecision	None	OR 2.02 (0.78, 5.24)	VERY LOW			

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup> Downgraded by 1 increment if the majority of the evidence was at high risk of bias and downgraded by 2 increments if the majority of the evidence was at very high risk of bias.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup> Imprecision was considered serious if the confidence intervals crossed the null line