

Additional file 3. Summary of findings

Secondary alveolar bone grafting in patients with cleft lip and palate

Patient or population: Secondary alveolar bone graft

Setting:

Intervention: rhBMP2

Comparison: Iliac crest

| Outcomes | Anticipated absolute effects* (95% CI) | | Relative effect (95% CI) | N° of participants (studies) | Certainty of the evidence (GRADE) | Comments |
|----------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------|------------------------------|-----------------------------------|----------|
| | Risk with Iliac crest | Risk with BMP-2 | | | | |
| Bone volume follow up: 6 months | The mean bone volume ranged from 48-76 % | The mean bone volume in the intervention group was 14,41 % fewer (22,39 fewer to 6,42 fewer) | - | 35 (3 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^a | |
| Bone volume follow up: 12 months | The mean bone volume ranged from 66-80 % | The mean bone volume in the intervention group was 6,22 % more (15,96 fewer to 28,42 more) | - | 49 (3 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^a | |
| Bone height follow up: 6 months | The mean bone height ranged from 64-83 % | The mean bone height in the intervention group was 18,73 % fewer (43,56 fewer to 6,08 more) | - | 28 (2 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^a | |
| Bone height follow up: 12 months | The mean bone height ranged from 64-86 % | The mean bone height in the intervention group was 4,4 % fewer (30,63 fewer to 21,83 more) | - | 49 (3 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^a | |
| Hospital stay | The mean hospital stay ranged from 1.8-3.3 days | The mean hospital stay in the intervention group was 1,14 days fewer (2,14 fewer to 0,14 fewer) | - | 26 (2 RCTs) | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE ^a | |

***The risk in the intervention group** (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison on group and the **relative effect** of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; **MD:** Mean difference

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High certainty: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low certainty: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

Explanations

a. All the studies are assessed as being at high risk of bias . Random sequence generation: All the studies mentioned random allocation but none mentioned the detail of sequence generation. Thus the sequence generation was not clear. Allocation concealment: None of the included studies had clearly described the allocation concealment. Blinding of participants and personnel: None of the studies mentioned whether the surgeon or participants were blinded, so blinding was also considered to be unknown. Blinding of outcome assessment: None of the studies mentioned blinding of outcome assessors Incomplete outcome data: From all the studies, there were no reported dropouts. Selective reporting: In Dickinson 2008 some of the variables mentioned in "materials and methods" was not fully reported in "results ". Other bias: We did not find any other source of bias.