| Secondary alveolar bone grafting in patients with cleft lip and palate | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-----------------|---------------|--------------|-------------|---------------------|--|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------|---|--|
| Certainty assessment | | | | | | | Summary of findings | | | | |
| № of participants (studies) Follow-up | Risk of bias | Inconsistency | Indirectness | Imprecision | Publication bias | Overall certainty of evidence | Study event rates (%) | | Relative effect | Anticipated absolute effects | |
| | | | | | | | With Iliac crest | With BMP-2 | - (95% CI) | Risk with Iliac crest | Risk difference with BMP- 2 |
| Bone volume (follow up: 6 months) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 35 (3 RCTs) | serious a | not serious | not serious | not serious | none | ⊕⊕⊕○ MODERATE | 17 | 18 | - | The mean bone volume ranged from 48-76 % | MD 14.41 % fewer (22.39 fewer to 6.42 fewer) |
| Bone volume (follow up: 12 months) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 (3 RCTs) | serious a | not serious | not serious | not serious | none | ⊕⊕⊕o MODERATE | 26 | 23 | - | The mean bone volume ranged from 66-80 % | MD 6.22 % more (15.96 fewer to 28.42 more) |
| Bone height (follow up: 6 months) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 28 (2 RCTs) | serious a | not serious | not serious | not serious | none | ⊕⊕⊕o MODERATE | 14 | 14 | - | The mean bone height ranged from 64-83 % | MD 18.73 % fewer (43.56 fewer to 6.08 more) |
| Bone height (follow up: 12 months) | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 49 (3 RCTs) | serious a | not serious | not serious | not serious | none | ⊕⊕⊕o MODERATE | 26 | 23 | - | The mean bone height ranged from 64-86 % | MD 4.4 % fewer (30.63 fewer to 21.83 more) |
| Hospital stay | | | | | | | | | | | |

CI: Confidence interval; MD: Mean difference

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, s o 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 drop outs Selective reporting: In Dickinson 2008 some of the variables mentioned in "materials and methods" were not fully reported in "results". Other bias: We did not find any other source of bias.