SCIENTIFIC REPORTS

Received: 1 June 2018 Accepted: 26 April 2019 Published online: 07 May 2019

OPEN The efficiency and safety of steroid addition to multimodal cocktail periarticular injection in knee joint arthroplasty: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials

Zhenhan Deng^{1,2}, Yusheng Li^{2,3}, Garrett R. Storm⁴, Ronak Naveenchandra Kotian⁵, Xuying Sun⁶, Guanghua Lei^{2,3}, Shanshan Gao⁴ & Wei Lu¹

Steroids are frequently used for postoperative pain relief without definite evidence. This study was conducted to assess the pain management effect of the addition of steroids to a multimodal cocktail periarticular injection (MCPI) in patients undergoing knee arthroplasty and evaluate their safety. Pubmed, Embase, and Cochrane Library were searched through April, 2018. A total of 918 patients from ten randomized controlled trials (RCTs) were ultimately included. Compared with placebo groups, steroids application could effectively relieve pain on postoperative day (POD)1; decrease C-Reactive protein (CRP) level on POD3; improve range of motion (ROM) in postoperative 5 days; reduce morphine consumption, achieve earlier straight leg raising (SLR), and shorten the length of stay (LOS) in hospital. With regards to adverse effects, it did not increase the risk of postoperative infection, postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV), or other complications. However, no significant difference in pain relief, ROM, or increased Knee Society Knee Function Scores were found during long-term follow up. Overall, this meta-analysis ensured the efficiency and safety of steroids with MCPI in knee arthroplasty patients during the early postoperative period.

Knee osteoarthritis (KOA) is a degenerative disease involving the intra-articular tibiofemoral and patellofemoral cartilage¹. It causes chronic pain, functional limitation, and emotional disturbance which may lead to disability and poor quality of life². A knee arthroplasty (KA) is a reliable and suitable surgical procedure for end-stage OA patients to relieve pain, to recover function and to improve health related quality of life³. With the creative designs and improved skills, we are now entering a new phase in which partial osteoarthritic changes can be treated with partial resurfacing prosthetic solutions such as unicompartmental, bi-unicompartmental or patellofemoral arthroplasty⁴. However, no matter what type of KA is performed, this surgery has commonly been associated with severe postoperative pain as well as postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV). This can result in immense discomfort, emotional distress, low satisfaction, and further leads to poor surgical outcomes and delayed postoperative recovery^{5,6}. Therefore, effective management of postoperative pain is essential for early rehabilitation and better functional outcomes. Various procedures including continuous epidural anesthesia, local infiltration anesthesia, peripheral nerve block, and patient controlled analgesia (PCA) are taken to control pain.

¹Department of Sports Medicine, the First Affiliated Hospital of Shenzhen University, Shenzhen Second People's Hospital, Shenzhen, Guangdong, China. ²Department of Orthopaedics, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan, China. ³National Clinical Research Center for Geriatric Disorders, Xiangya Hospital, Central South University, Changsha, Hunan, China. ⁴Department of Cardiology, University of Colorado Denver, Aurora, Colorado, USA. ⁵Department of Orthopaedics, Victoria Hospital, Bangalore Medical College and Research Institute, Bangalore, India. ⁶Department of Orthopaedics, Biological Engineering and Regenerative Medicine Center, Tongji Hospital, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, Hubei, China. Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to Y.L. (email: liyusheng@csu.edu.cn) or S.G. (email: Shanshan.gao@ucdenver.edu) or W.L. (email: weilu9309@gmail.com)

As an orthopedic surgeon, we place great concerns on the multimodal cocktail periarticular or intra-articular injection (MCPI) strategy after KA for analgesia. Not only this treatment is proven to be a safe and cost-effectiveness measure^{7,8}, but also this intervention is easy to perform. Although the gold standard for the cocktail formula has not yet been set up, the components always contains local anesthetics (ropivacaine and bupivacaine), epinephrine, steroids, opioids and nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs)⁹⁻¹¹. However, whether those compositions are all necessary is still to be investigated considering the efficacy and safety.

Steroids have been extensively used in various perioperative settings due to their potent anti-inflammatory and antiemetic effects^{12,13}. Clinical trials have indicated that the addition of steroids to MCPI might decrease edema and blood loss and achieve permanently better range of motion (ROM) due to reduced local inflammatory response following surgical trauma^{14,15}. Some studies have advocated the use of steroids for the benefits of post-operative pain relief and reduced risk of POVN¹⁶⁻¹⁸, while others have found no significant decrease in pain and PONV with administration of steroids^{19,20}. Moreover, periarticular steroids use may arouse concerns for possible postoperative infection and patellar tendon rupture²¹. To sum up, it remains inconclusive whether the addition of steroids in the MCPI is necessary.

Several meta-analyses have been launched to address the efficacy and safety of steroids application in knee joint arthroplasty. The major drawback of these studies is not distinguishing local usage of steroid from systemic application^{12,22-28}, which may hamper the reliability of the conclusion. Only three studies focused on the periarticular application of steroids in KA^{26,27,29}. In Tran's study, only five studies were included and there was no overwhelming data to suggest the addition of steroids to MPCPI improves postoperative total knee arthroplasty (TKA) pain²⁶. In Zhao's study, only six RCTs met the inclusion criteria and it was found that the addition of steroids to MCPI could improve the analgesic effect and was proved to be highly safe in patients undergoing TKA, but it couldn't increase the postoperative ROM of knee joint²⁷. Though eight studies were evaluated in Xing's meta-analysis, it didn't assess the analgesia effect of the steroid in patients underwent joint arthroplasty, the results showed that intraarticular steroid injections may lead to increased deep infection rates of subsequent joint arthroplasty²⁹. Moreover, all of these studies were confined to TKA with a limited number of studies included. Actually, for the patients suffering KA, no matter whether partial knee arthroplasty (PKA) or TKA are performed, the mechanisms of pain, stress and other reactions that caused by KA might be similar³⁰⁻³². Consequently, the aim of this study is to systematically summarize the available scientific literatures on all kinds of KA to evaluate the efficacy and safety the addition of steroids addition to MCPI by conducting a quantitative meta-analysis including randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

Results

Search results. A total of 918 potentially relevant articles wereidentified from the databases, including 315 duplicated articles; 698 studies were excluded after screening titles and abstracts. 34 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility, of which 24 were excluded after assessment of the full-text articles. Eventually, ten^{14,21,33-40} articles that fulfilled the inclusion criteria were identified for synthetic evaluation. The flow diagram is presented in Fig. 1.

Study characteristics. Demographic characteristics, the details about the included studies are summarized in Table 1. Ten RCTs were performed in 7 countries, involving 820 participants. Eight^{21,33–39} of the ten trials performed TKA surgery, while the other two^{21,40} performed UKA. Both experimental and control groups were tightly matched in sample size, age, sex, and body mass index (BMI). Experimental groups received single-dose postoperative intraarticular injection or periarticular infiltration of steroids, while control groups received placebo or none. Four studies^{33–35,38} performed spinal anesthesia (SA), two^{36,37} opted for general anesthesia (GA), one²¹ received endotracheal anaesthesia (EA), and the other three^{14,39,40} received SA or GA. PCA with opioid, was given to all participates for concomitant pain management. The follow-up period ranged from 1 week to 2 years.

Risk of bias assessment. Cochrane Collaboration tool was used to assess the RCTs (Table 2). Double blinding was provided in all RCTs. The randomization algorithm was mentioned in 6 trials^{14,21,33,37–39}, including random number generator, block randomization, random numbers, and randomization table. Four trials^{34–36,40} recorded the allocation concealment information by sealed envelopes. Other assessments, such as blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and selective reports, were all in good performance.

Visual analogue pain score (VAS). All studies recorded pain score, but only 4 trials^{21,33,37,38} provided detailed data as means and standard deviations (SDs). Two studies^{33,38} reported both VAS at rest (RVAS) and during activity (AVAS). AVAS could not be collected for analysis due to unsuitable format of the data. Therefore, if not specifically mentioned, VAS at different time points were all considered as RVAS. Finally, postoperative day (POD) 1, 3 and postoperative week (POW) 2 were eligible for meta-analysis. The result showed that VAS was significantly lower in the steroids group than the control group on POD1 (MD = -1.52, 95% CI -2.94 to -0.10, P = 0.04). However, no significant difference was found between the two groups on POD3 and POW 2. Random-effect models were used to perform meta-analysis for POD1 ($I^2 = 82\%$, P = 0.004) and POD3 ($I^2 = 76\%$, P = 0.04) as the substantial heterogeneity was high (Fig. 2).

Range of motion (ROM). Seven studies^{14,21,33,35,37,38,40} provided detailed data. Eleven time points were analyzed which included POD1, 2, 3, 4, 5, POW1, 2, 4, 6, and postoperative month (POM) 3, 6, respectively. The results showed that the steroids group had significantly better ROM on the first postoperative 5 days: POD1 (MD = 11.57, 95% CI 9.85 to 13.30, P < 0.00001), POD2 (MD = 9.03, 95% CI 6.67 to 11.38, P < 0.00001), POD3 (MD = 5.73, 95% CI 0.85 to 10.60, P = 0.02), POD4 (MD = 5.53, 95% CI 0.68 to 10.38, P = 0.03), and POD5 (MD = 5.90, 95% CI 0.87 to 10.93, P = 0.02). However, the difference was not significant after POW1. The substantial heterogeneity was high at POW4 ($I^2 = 94\%$, P < 0.00001), POM3 ($I^2 = 93\%$, P < 0.00001), and POM6



Figure 1. Flow chart of studyselection.

 $(I^2 = 81\%, P = 0.006)$. Therefore, the random-effect models were used for these outcomes. Fixed-effect models were applied at other time points (Fig. 3).

Morphine consumption. Three studies^{14,21,37} provided detailed data for postoperative morphine consumption and the total amount used during hospitalization was accumulated for analysis. A random-effect model was used due to significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 68\%$, P = 0.02). The overall effect showed that morphine consumption for the steroid groups were significantly less than that for the control groups (MD = -7.94, 95% CI -14.35 to -1.53, P = 0.02; Fig. 4a).

C-reactive protein (CRP). Three studies^{37,38,40} provided detailed data for CRP level, but only one time point included two studies that were eligible for meta-analysis. Pooled results showed that the CRP level on POD3 in the steroid groups was significantly lower than that in control groups (WMD = -4.82, 95% CI -7.41 to -2.23, P = 0.0003). Random-effect models were used for this study ($I^2 = 84\%$, P = 0.01; Fig. 4b).

Straight leg raising (SLR). The interval required to perform a SLR was collected from three studies^{14,35,37} involving 282 knees. The result indicated that the patients in the steroid groups could perform a SLR significantly earlier than those in the control groups (MD = -0.65, 95% CI -0.86 to -0.44, P < 0.00001). Statistical heterogeneity was not found in SLR ($I^2 = 43\%$, P = 0.17). A fixed-effects model was performed (Fig. 4c).

Length of stay (LOS). Two studies^{21,40} provided detailed data with regard to length of stay in hospital. The results indicated that the patients in the steroid groups had significantly shorter LOS than that of the control groups (MD = -0.98, 95% CI -1.25 to -0.71, P < 0.00001). The fixed-effects model was selected as no significant heterogeneity was found ($I^2 = 0\%, P = 0.78$; Fig. 4d).

Knee society knee and function scores (KSS). Two studies^{21,35} provided detailed data of KSS knee scores and function scores, respectively. Only 1 time point was eligible for meta-analysis. During the follow-up evaluation POM6, the patients in the steroid groups did not achieve higher KSS knee scores than the control groups (MD = 0.54, 95% CI - 0.64 to 1.72, P = 0.37, Fig. 4e). A fixed-effects model was performed because of low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0\%$, P = 0.55). Likewise, the KSS function scores were also similar between the two groups (MD = -2.47, 95% CI - 11.62 to 6.68, P = 0.60). A random-effect model was used due to significant heterogeneity ($I^2 = 56\%$, P = 0.13; Fig. 4f).

				Steroids group				No-Steroids group								
Study	Year of publication	Country	Surgery	N	Mean age (years)	Sex (Male/ female)	BMI (Kg/m ²)	Intervention	N	Mean age (years)	Sex (Male/ female)	BMI (Kg/m ²)	Intervention	Anaesthesia	Perioperative analgesia	Follow -up
Chia	2013	Australia	TKA	42	68.9 ± 8.0	NA	30.85 ± 5.5	TA 40 mg (+100 ml 0.2% ropivacaine +1:1000 adrenaline)	42	65.09 ± 8.4	NA	31.49 ±4.7	No TA (+others)	SA	Postopertive oral celecoxib + oxycodone, dextropropoxypheneand paracetamol	12 weeks
Christian	2009	USA	TKA	39	65.8 ±11.1	16/23	32.9 ±6.5	MP 40 mg +bupivacaine 80 mg + morphine 4 mg + epinephrine 300 mg + clonidine 100 mg + cefuroxime 750 mg)	37	65.2 ±11.0	7/30	35.1 ± 8.0	No MP (+others)	EA	Preoperative oral celecoxib + oxycodone hydrochloride/oxycodone and acetaminophen preoperatively	12 weeks
Ikeuchi	2014	Japan	ТКА	20	77±6	2/18	NA	DA 6.6 mg (+0.75% ropivacaine + isepamicin 400 mg)	20	76 ±3	4/16	NA	No DA (+others)	GA	Postoperative PCA + oral loxoprofen + fentanyl injection	12 weeks
Kim	2015	Korea	TKA	43	71.4 ±4.7	41/2	25.8 ± 3.3	MP 40 mg (+ropivacaine 180 mg + morphine 5 mg + ketorolac 30 mg)	45	70.6 ±5.5	39/4	27.2 ± 4.0	No MP (+others)	SA	Preoperative oral celecoxib + tramadol; Postoperative PCA + oral celecoxib + tramado + pethidineintramuscular injection (rescue) + oral oxycodone (rescue)	1 week
Kwon	2014	Korea	TKA	76	69.3 (62–77)	0/76	25.9 (22–32)	TA 40 mg (+morphine 10 mg + ropivacaine 300 mg + ketorolac 30 mg + 1:1000 of epinephrine300 ug)	76	69.3 (62–77)	0/76	25.9 (22-32)	No TA (+others)	SA	PostoperativePCA + oral celecoxib and ultracet + ketoprofenintramuscular injection (rescue)	6 months
Ng	2011	Singapore	UKA	41	63 (53–71)	10/31	28 (23-32)	TA 40 mg (+0.5% bupivacaine + 1:200,000 epinephrine)		62 (55–70)	11/31	27 (21-32)	No TA (+others)	SA or GA	Postoperative PCA + oral Synflex + oral amotidine	6 months
Pang	2008	Singapore	UKA	45	68 (54–80)	8/37	27.3 ±6.1	TA 40 mg (+0.5 ml/ kg of 1:200,000 epinephrine + 0.5% bupivacaine)	45	67 (44-80)	8/37	27.5±5.6	No TA (+others)	SA or GA	Postoperative PCA + oral naproxen	2 years
Seah	2011	Singapore	ТКА	29	67.9	NA	26.7	TA 40 mg (+0.5 ml/ kg of 1:200,000 epinephrine + 0.5% bupivacaine)	30	65.4	NA	27.3	No TA (+others)	SA or GA	Postoperative PCA + oral naproxen	2 years
Tsukada	2016	Japan	TKA	38	75 (58–88)	5/35	26.7 (20.5–38.6)	MP 40 mg (+ropivacaine 300 mg + morphine 8 mg + epinephrine 0.3 mg + ketoprofen 50 mg	37	72 (47-88)	32/5	27.3 (18.4–40.6)	No MP (+others)	SA	Postoperative oral loxoprofen + diclofenacsodium (rescue)	1 year
Yue	2013	China	TKA	36	70.2 ± 6.4	32/4	25.23 ±4.81	BA 1 mg (+30 ml 0.75% ropivacaine + 0.5 ml1:1000 adrenaline)	36	69.3 ± 5.7	32/4	26.14 ± 3.27	No BA (+others)	GA	Preoperative celecoxib; Postoperative PCA + oral celecoxib + morphine intramuscular injection (rescue)	1 year

Table 1. Characteristics of ten included RCTs. Surgery: TKA, total knee arthroplasty; UKA, unicondylar knee arthroplasty. Intervention: BA, betamethasone; DA, dexamethasone; MP, methylprednisolone; TA, triamcinoloneacetonide. Anaesthesia: SA, spinal anaesthesia; EA, endotracheal anaesthesia; GA, general anaesthesia. Perioperative analgesia: PCA, patient-controlled analgesia. NA, not available.

Complications. All ten included studies reported the incidence of various complications such as PONV, infection, and wound oozing. There was no significant difference in total incidence of complications between the steroid and control groups (OR = -1.07, 95% CI 0.63 to 1.82, P = 0.81; Fig. 5a).

There were only two types of complications mentioned in at least two papers. Three studies^{14,21,39} involving 225 patients reported the occurrence of postoperative infection, and the steroid groups did not have an increased number of patients with infection (OR = 1.29, 95% CI 0.31 to 5.38, P = 0.72; Fig. 5b). Four trials^{33–35,37} involving 352 patients were included that assessed the occurrence of PONV. According to the outcomes, the incidence of PONV in the two groups was also similar (OR = 0.78, 95% CI 0.46 to 1.34, P = 0.37; Fig. 5c). The fixed-effects models were applied in these 4 cases due to the low heterogeneity ($I^2 = 0$ %). All the results of this meta-analysis are presented in Table 3.

Discussion

This meta-analysis assessed the efficacy and safety of the addition of steroids to MCPI for pain management and physical dysfunction of TKA and UKA patients. The current evidence shows that periarticular steroids injection

Study	Random sequence generation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of participants and personnel	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Other bias
Chia	+ (a)	+*	+	+	+	+	;
Christian	+ (b)	;	+	+	+	+	;
Ikeuchi	+ (c)	+*	+	+	+	+	;
Kim	;	;	+	+	+	+	;
Kwon	;	;	+	+	+	+	;
Ng	;	;	+	+	+	?	;
Pang	+ (d)	;	+	+	+	+	;
Seah	+ (d)	+*	+	+	+	+	;
Tsukada	+ (c)	+*	+	+	+	+	;
Yue	;	;	+	+	;	+	?

Table 2. Methodological quality assessment according to the Cochrane Collaboration's Risk of Bias tool study. +, low risk of bias; -, high risk of bias; ? unclear risk of bias. Random sequencegeneration: a, random number generator; b, block randomization; c, random numbers; d, randomization table. Allocationconcealment: *sealed envelopes.

.

VAS

a. POD1	St	teroid		No-	Steroi	d		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% Cl
Christian 2009	4.1	3.1	39	4.8	2.1	37	31.8%	-0.70 [-1.89, 0.49]	
Ikeuchi 2014	1.4	1.3	20	4.3	1.8	20	34.3%	-2.90 [-3.87, -1.93]	_
Tsukada 2016	1.7	2.09	38	2.6	2.34	36	33.9%	-0.90 [-1.91, 0.11]	
Total (95% CI)			97			93	100.0%	-1.52 [-2.94, -0.10]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.28; Ch	ni² = 10	0.90, df	= 2 (P =	= 0.004	1); ² = ;	82%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.10	(P = 0	0.04)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
b. POD3	S	teroid		No-	Steroi	d		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
Ikeuchi 2014	2.7	1.6	20	4.3	1.8	20	48.9%	-1.60 [-2.66, -0.54]	_
Tsukada 2016	2.9	1.73	35	3	2.33	35	51.1%	-0.10 [-1.06, 0.86]	
Total (95% CI)			55			55	100.0%	-0.83 [-2.30, 0.64]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.86; Ch	ni² = 4.	24, df =	= 1 (P =	0.04);	l ² = 76	%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.11	(P = (0.27)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
c. POW2	s	teroid	Ľ	No	-Stero	id		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% CI
Chia 2013	6.5	2.9	42	7.48	3.1	42	35.9%	-0.98 [-2.26, 0.30]	
Ikeuchi 2014	2.09	1.78	20	2.19	1.28	20	64.1%	-0.10 [-1.06, 0.86]	
Total (95% CI)			62			62	100.0%	-0.42 [-1.19, 0.35]	-
Heterogeneity: Chi ² =	1.16, df	= 1 (P	= 0.28); I ² = 14	1%			-	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.06	6 (P = 1	0.29)						-4 -2 U 2 4
									Favours (experimental) Favours (control)

Figure 2. Forest plot diagram showing VAS at POD1 (a), POD3 (b), POW2 (c).

is certainly effective in pain relief and improved ROM during the early stage after surgery, and is able to reduce morphine consumption, decrease CRP level, achieve earlier SLR, and shorten LOS, but the analgesic effect and functional outcomes were not significant compared to placebo groups during the late postoperative period. The most encouraging result is that the periarticular steroids injection did not increase the risk of postoperative infection, PONV, or other complications. Therefore, we conclude that steroids are more likely to play a positive role during the early postoperative period.

The forest plots indicated that the addition of steroids could further improve the analgesic efficacy of MCPI during the hyper-acute phase as we observed VAS score significantly decreased on the POD1 in the steroids group. The suppression of the inflammatory response by steroids application can be explained by the signaling pathways that suppress the cytoactivity of immune cells by inhibiting the production of phospholipase A2 (PLA2) and hence decreasing the production of inflammatory cytokines and chemokines⁴¹. Previous studies had detected lowered interleukin (IL)-6 and serum CRP level in cases treated with systemic and local steroids^{37,40}. Our results also found decreased serum CRP level on the third day after surgery, proving the anti-inflammatory effects of steroids. Consistently, with the relief of postoperative pain, morphine consumption during the hospitalization was significantly decreased, and the time required to perform a SLR and LOS were also shortened in the steroids group. However, analgesic effect in the steroids group was not significant at POD3 and POW2, which indicated that MCPI with steroids could not provide a sustained analgesic effect. Steroids might play a pivotal role, but the effect of local anesthetics would disappear gradually over time.

ROM

Ste	eroid		No-	Steroic	1		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Mean 78.1	SD 13.7	Total 30	Mean 73.7	SD 15.1	Total 37	Weight 7 1%	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
75.5	4.5	41	63.1	4.4	42	81.1%	12.40 [10.48, 14.32]		
63.8	19.7	45	53.5	10.1	45	7.1%	10.30 [3.83, 16.77]		_
67	15.9	38	57	18.8	37	4.8%	10.00 [2.11, 17.89]		
		163			161	100.0%	11.57 [9.85, 13.30]	▲	
5.71, df =	: 3 (P :	= 0.13);	(l ² = 47)	%				-20 -10 0 10	20
Z = 13.15	5 (P <	0.0000	1)					Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
51	laroid		No	Staroi	a		Mean Difference	Moon Difference	
Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl	
86.7	3.2	41	77.7	8.2	42	78.1%	9.00 [6.33, 11.67]		
80.3	19.7	45	70.5	9.5 18.8	45	13.6%	9.80 [3.41, 16.19]		
10	11.0	00	00	10.0	0,	0.070	0.00 [-0.10, 10.10]		
	- 0 /0	124	12 - 00	,	124	100.0%	9.03 [6.67, 11.38]	-	
0.12, df = 7 = 7.51	= 2 (P (P < 0	= 0.94) 00001); I* = 0% 1)	6				-20 -10 0 10	20
	(, , ,		· ·					Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
St	teroid		No	Steroi	d		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
92.8	18.8	45	84.1	13.1	45	55.6%	2.00 [-5.32, 9.32]		
					0.		2.00 [0.02, 0.02]		
4 70 46	- 4 /D	83	12 - 44	10/	82	100.0%	5.73 [0.85, 10.60]		
Z = 2.30	= 1 (P 1 (P = (= 0.18)).02)	; l* = 44	70				-20 -10 0 10	20
		,						Favours (experimental) Favours (control)	
St	teroid		No	Steroi	d		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	IV. Fixed. 95% Cl	
95.6	20	45	87.2	10	45	55.1%	8.40 [1.87, 14.93]		
86	17.4	38	84	14.5	37	44.9%	2.00 [-5.24, 9.24]	-	
		83			82	100.0%	5.53 [0.68, 10.38]		
1.65, df =	= 1 (P	= 0.20)); I ² = 40	1%				-20 -10 0 10	20
L = 2.23	(==(.03)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
e-	areld		Nc	Store	d.		Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV. Fixed, 95% CI	IV, Fixed, 95% CI	
96.9	20	45	89	10	45	59.2%	7.90 [1.37, 14.43]		
87	18.8	38	84	15.9	37	40.8%	3.00 [-4.87, 10.87]		
		83			82	100.0%	5.90 [0.87, 10.93]		
0.88, df =	= 1 (P	= 0.35)	; I² = 0%	6				-20 -10 0 10	20
Z = 2.30	(P = 0	.02)						Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
St	teroid	Total	No	-Stero	id Total	Weight	Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
106.2	10.2	76	105.2	8.9	76	77.0%	1.00 [-2.04, 4.04]		
01	40								
31	13	38	88	11.6	37	23.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57]		_
51	13	38	88	11.6	37	23.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57]		_
0.38, df	13 = 1 (P	38 114 = 0.54	88); l² = 0'	11.6	37 113	23.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13]		-
0.38, df Z = 1.07	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1	38 114 = 0.54 0.28)	88); I² = 0'	11.6 %	37 113	23.0%	3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13)	-10 -5 0 5 Favours (experimental) Favours (control)	 10
0.38, df Z = 1.07	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1	38 114 = 0.54 0.28)	88); I² = 0'	11.6 %	37 113	23.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	— 10
0.38, df Z = 1.07 Si	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 teroid	38 114 = 0.54 0.28)	88); I² = 0' No	11.6 % -Steroi	37 113 d	23.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 Favours (experimental) Favours (control) Mean Difference	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St <u>Mean</u>	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 teroid <u>SD</u>	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u>	88); I ² = 0' No <u>Mean</u>	11.6 % -Steroi	37 113 d <u>Total</u>	23.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimenta] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	— 10
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St <u>Mean</u> 93.7	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 teroid SD 13.8	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42	88); I ² = 0' No <u>Mean</u> 95.7	11.6 % -Steroi 	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 27	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.75, 7.51]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	— 10
0.38, df Z = 1.07 <u>Mean</u> 93.7 95	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38	88); I ² = 0' <u>No</u> <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95	11.6 % -Steroi <u>SD</u> 13.1 17.4	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 37	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St <u>Mean</u> 93.7 95	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80	88); I ² = 0' <u>No</u> <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95	11.6 % -Steroi <u>SD</u> 13.1 17.4	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV_Fixed_95% Cl	— 10
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St <u>Mean</u> 93.7 95 0.17, df : Z = 0.55	13 = 1 (P (P = 1) teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68	88); I ² = 0' <u>No</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0?	11.6 % -Steroi <u>SD</u> 13.1 17.4	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed. 95% CI</u> -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29]	Head Difference NV Exect 95% CI	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St <u>Mean</u> 93.7 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55	13 = 1 (P (P = 1) teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P 5 (P = 0)	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59)	88); I ² = 0' <u>No Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0?	11.6 % Steroi 13.1 17.4	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] -2.00 [-7.52, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl -10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 93.7 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1) teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P 5 (P = 0)	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59)	88); I ² = 0' No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0?	11.6 % -Steroi 13.1 17.4 %	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80	23.0% 100.0% <u>Weight</u> 63.5% 36.5% 100.0%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimenta] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Exed. 95% CI -10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimenta] Favours [control] Mean Difference	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St Mean 93.7 95 0.17, df Z = 0.55 Ste Mean	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P 6 (P = 0 eroid <u>SD</u>	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59)	88); I ² = 0' <u>No 95.7</u> 95); I ² = 0? No-S <u>Mean</u>	11.6 % -Steroi 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 1	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight	. 3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] . 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference 	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl.	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St Mean 93.7 95 0.17, df Z = 0.55 Ste Mean 104	13 = 1 (P = 1) teroid $\frac{SD}{13.8}$ 15.9 = 1 (P = 0) δ (P = 0) = 0 = 10	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) <u>Fotal 1</u> 38	88); I ² = 0' <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0? <u>No-S</u> <u>Mean</u> 108	11.6 ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** ** *	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 50tal 37	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CL -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CL -4.00 (-10.94, 2.94)	-10 -5 -5 Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Excd. 95% Cl -10 -5 0 5 Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 93 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55 Ste Mean 104 110.7	13 = 1 (P = 1) teroid $\frac{SD}{13.8}$ 15.9 = 1 (P = 0) eroid $\frac{SD}{13.8}$ 3.2 2	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) <u>Total 1</u> 45 45 41 41	88); I ² = 0' <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0 <u>No-S</u> <u>Mean</u> 108 108.4	11.6 % Steroid 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 1 17.3 5 3,7	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 5 5 6 1 1 37 45 42	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% cl. 2.00 [-7, 2.372] 0.00 [-7, 55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% cl. 4.00 [-10.44, 2.94] 3.90 [2.7, 5.63] 2.80 [.47, 2.54] 3.90 [2.7, 5.63]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Eixed, 95% CI -10 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randem, 35% CI	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 937 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55 Ste <u>Mean</u> 104 110.7 105.6	13 = 1 (P = 1) teroid $\frac{SD}{13.8}$ 15.9 = 1 (P = 0) eroid $\frac{SD}{13}$ 3.2 3	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) <u>Total 1</u> 38 41	88 No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); l ² = 0 ⁽ No-S <u>Mean</u> 108 106.8	11.6 % Steroid 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 17.3 5 3.7	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 <u>50tal</u> 45 42	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) . 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% C1 -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% C1 -3.90 (-1.09, 4.24) -4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) -3.90 (-1.7, 5.63) -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35)	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl. Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, Cl. Havours [control]	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St 93.7 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55 Sta Mean 104 110.7 105.6	13 = 1 (P = 1) teroid $\frac{SD}{13.8}$ 15.9 = 1 (P = 0) $\frac{SD}{13}$ 3.2 3 3 + 32 = 2	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) <u>Fotal</u> 41 124	88 No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0! No-S <u>Mean</u> 108 108.4	11.6 Steroid 13.1 17.4 K teroid SD 1 17.3 3.7 2.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0 0.0	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 <u>5</u> 43 45 42 124	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0%	. 3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] . 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% cl -2.00 [-7.2, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference IV. Random, 35% cl -4.00 [-10.94, 2.64] 3.90 [2.77, 6.53] -3.00 [-12.52, -1.35] -0.57 [-6.09, 4.96]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV Fixed, 95% Cl -10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 35% Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 93.7 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55 Sto Mean 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20	13 = 1 (P = 1) teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 $= 1 (P = 0)$ 13.8 SD 1 3.2 3 Chi ² = 3 (P = 0)	38 114 = 0.54 (0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 (0.59) (0.59) (0.68) (0.59) (0.68) (0.59) (0.59) (0.54) (0.55) (0	88 No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0! No-S <u>Mean</u> 108 108.4 if = 2 (P	11.6 Steroid 13.1 17.4 (teroid SD 1 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00	37 113 dd <u>Total</u> 37 80 <u>50tal</u> 37 45 42 124 124	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0% I ² = 94%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference <u>W. Eixed. 95% CI.</u> -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference <u>IV. Random. 35% CI</u> -3.00 (-10.94, 2.94) 3.90 (21.7, 5.63) -2.80 (4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96)	Hean Difference W. Einder 95%, Cl. Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference W. Random, 35%, Cl. Mean Difference W. Random, 35%, Cl. Mean Difference U. Random, 35%, Cl. Mean Difference Mean Difference M	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St Mean 93.7 95 0.17, df = Z = 0.55 Ste Mean 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20	13 = 1 (P = 1) teroid SD 13.8 15.9 $= 1 (P = 1)$ 13.8 15.9 13.2 3 Chi ² = 3 (P = 0)	38 114 = 0.54 (0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 (0.59) (0.59) (0.59) (0.59) (0.59) (0.59) (0.59) (0.54) (0.55) (0	88 No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0! No-S <u>Mean</u> 108 106.8 108.4 if = 2 (P	11.6 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 d d <u>Total</u> 37 80 <u>50tal</u> 45 42 124 124 124	23.0% 100.0% 	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) . 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% C1 -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% C1 -4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) -3.90 (21.7, 5.63) -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96)	Hear Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. Hear Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. Hear Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. Hear Difference IV. Random, 95% C	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S; <u>Mean</u> 93.7 95 0.17, df Z = 0.55 Ste <u>Mean</u> 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20	13 = 1 (P ' (P = 1 teroid 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 eroid 3.2 3 Chi ² = 3 Chi ²	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) Fotal 1 38 45 	88 No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0! No-S <u>Mean</u> 108 106.8 108.4 if = 2 (P	11.6 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 <u>50tal</u> 42 42 42 42 124 42 42 42 42	23.0% 100.0% 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0% I ² = 94%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference (V. Fixed. 95% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference (V. Random, 35% CI -3.00 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Eixed. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 35% CI -20 -10 0 10 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S 93.7 95 0.17, df : Z = 0.55 Ste 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 Ste Mean	13 = 1 (P ' (P = 1 teroid 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 eroid 3.2 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 2.2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) Fotal 1 38 45 	88 Noo 95.7 95); I ² = 0! No-S No-S 106.8 108.4 if = 2 (P Noo Mean	11.6 % -Steroid SD 1 17.4 % teroid SD 1 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 <u>50tal</u> 42 42 42 124 42 124 42 124 42 124 42	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) . 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference . 2.00 (-7.23, 372) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) . 1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, 95% CI</u> . 4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) . 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) . 2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) 0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, 95% CI</u> .	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 Sr 937 95 0.17, df : Z = 0.55 Stat 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 Stat Mean 111.5	13 = 1 (P (P = 1) teroid SD 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 SD 13 3.2 3 (P = 0 teroid SD 13 (P = 0 teroid SD 13 3.2 13 3.2 15 13 13 15 13 13 15 13 13 15 13 13 15 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13 13	38 114 = 0.54 (0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 (0.59) (0.68) (0.59) (0.59) (0.68) (0.59) (0.68) (0.54) (0.55) (0	88 No Mean 95.7 95); I ² = 0 ⁽ 95.7 95); I ² = 0 ⁽ No-S Mean 108.4 if = 2 (P No- Mean 113.1	11.6 % -Steroid SD 1 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 1 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 9.7 9.7	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 80 <u>37</u> 45 42 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 45 42 124 45 42 124 45 42 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.5%	3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference W. Fixed 35% CI -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.75, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference IV. Random, 35% CI -2.00 [-7.75, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference IV. Random, 35% CI -2.80 [-4.25, -5.3] -2.057 [-6.09, 4.96] Mean Difference IV. Read, 35% GI -1.50 [-5.80, 2.70]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimenta] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Exed. 95%, CI -20 -10 0 10 Favours [experimenta] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Random, 95%, CI -20 -10 0 10 Favours [experimenta] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95%, CI	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S 93.7 95 0.17, df 93.7 95 0.17, df 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 Ste <u>Mean</u> 104 110.7 105.6	13 = 1 (P (P = 1) teroid SD 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 eroid SD 13 3.2 3 (P = 0 teroid SD 10.5 12.5 10.7	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) Fotal 124 (5.00, d 8.84) Total 42 38 45 	88 No Mean 95.7 95); I ² = 0' 95.7 95); I ² = 0' No-S Mean 108.4 if = 2 (P No- Mean 113.1 107.7	11.6 % Steroid 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 12.5 12.5 12.5 12.5 12.5 12.5 12.5 13.1 17.4 17.5	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 80 37 45 42 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 37 7 6	23.0% 100.0% Weight 42.2% 38.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 38.1% 100.0% Weight 35.5% 16.5%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV. Eixed. 95% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI. 4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) 3.00 (2.17, 5.63) -2.20 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV. Eixed. 95% (-3.55) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV. Eixed. 95% (-3.55) -1.00 (-5.50, 7.70) -1.00 (-5.50, 7.70) -2.20 (-5.50, 7.70) -2.20 (-5.50, 7.70) -3.20 (-5.50, 7.70) -	Hean Difference W. Random, 255 CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference W. Random, 255 CI Favours [control] Mean Difference	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S <u>Mean</u> 93.7 95 0.17, df 10.7, df 110.7 2 = 0.55 Stt Mean 104 110.7 2 = 0.20 20.33; C Z = 0.20 St <u>Mean</u> 111.5 131.1	13 teroid SD 13.8 15.9 $= 1 (P = 0$ 13.8 15.9 $= 1 (P = 0$ SD 13 3.2 3 $(P = 0$ SD 10.5 12.5 10.7	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 0 = 0.68 3.59) Total 124 15.00, d 8.84) Total 42 39 76	88 No <u>Mean</u> 95.7 95); I ² = 0' 95.7 95); I ² = 0' No-S 106.8 108.4 108.4 if = 2 (P No- No- S 108 108.4 if = 2 (P No- No- S 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	11.6 % Steroid 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 9.7 15.3 12.5	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 ^C otal 43 37 45 42 124 0001); 1 d Total 43 37 76	23.0% 100.0% 65.5% 36.5% 100.0% 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 38.1% 38.1% 24.2% 410.0%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) . 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Maan Difference IV. Fixed, 35% CL -2.00 (-7.23, 372) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CL -4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CL -1.60 (-5.90, 2.70) 2.80 (-6.50, 7.10) 2.80 (-0.90, 6.50)	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. Heat Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl. Heat Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. H	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S Mean. 93.7 95 0.17, df df 2 = 0.55 Stat. 104 110.7 105.6 2 = 0.20 Stat. 2 = 0.20 Stat. 108.5 131.1	13 r (P = 1) teroid 13.8 15.9 r (P = 1) r (P	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) Fotal 124 15.00, d 84) Total 41 124 15.00, d 84) Total 42 38 45 41 41 42 38 45 41 42 38 45 41 42 38 45 41 42 38 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	88 No Mean 95.7 95 No-S No-S 108 108.4 108.4 108.4 108.4 108.4 108.4 108.4 108.4 108.2 109.2 108	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 5 42 124 0001); 1 45 42 124 0001); 1 d Total 43 37 76 156	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 38.1% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 10.0%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference (V. Fixed. 95% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.75, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference (V. Faxdom. 95% CI. 3.90 (2.17, 563) -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference (V. Faxd. 95% CI. -3.69 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.81 (-1.65, 3.47)	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Exed, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 93,7 95 0.17, df 1 Z = 0.55 Stu Mean 104 20.33; C Z = 0.20 Sta 105,6 110,7 105,6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 Sta 111,5 108,5 108,5 108,5 108,5 108,5 20,23; C Z = 0.20 Sta 20,23; C Z = 0.20 Sta 20,25 Sta 20,20	$= 1 (P)^{2} (P = 1)^{2} (P =$	38 114 114 20.28) <u>Total</u> 42 38 45 41 41 42 38 45 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41 41	88 No Mean 95.7 95); I ² = 0' 95); I ² = 0' No-S Mean 108.4 if = 2 (P No-8 108.4 if = 2 (P No-8 107.4 if = 2 (P)	11.6 % Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 1 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 %	37 113 dd Total 37 45 42 124 0001); l d Total 37 45 42 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 100.0% № 100.0% Weight 10.0% 10.0% 10.0% 10.0%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV, Eixed, <u>95% CI</u> , -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV, Random, <u>95% CI</u> , -3.00 (-1.09, 4, 94) 3.90 (217, 5.63) -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV, Fixed, <u>95% CI</u> , -1.60 (-5.90, 2.70) 2.80 (-5.90, 7.10) 2.80 (-5.90, 7.10) 3.90 (-5.50, 7.10)	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 93.7 95 0.17, df 1 Z = 0.55 Stet Mean 104 20.33; C Z = 0.20 20.33; C Z = 0.20 111.5 108.5 131.1 2.31, df = Z = 0.69	$13 = 1 (P = 1)$ $\frac{13}{(P = 1)}$ $\frac{13}{(P = 1)}$ $\frac{13}{13} = 1 (P = 1)$ $\frac{13}{13} = 1 (P = 1)$ $\frac{13}{13} = 3$ $\frac{3.2}{(P = 1)}$	38 114 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 45 41 41 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	88 No Mean 95.7 95); I ² = 0! 95.7 95); I ² = 0! 95); I ² = 0! 108.4 108.4 if = 2 (P No- Mean 113.1 107.7 128.3 ; I ² = 14	11.6 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 dd Total 37 45 42 124 0001); l d Total 43 37 76 45 42 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0% Weight 100.0%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) . 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% C1 . 2.00 (-7.23, 372) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) . 1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% C1 . 4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) . 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) . 2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) 0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% C1 	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% Cl. Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl. Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl. Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 93.7 95 0.17, df 102 102, df 2 = 0.55 Ste Mean 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 St <u>Mean</u> 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; df 31.1 11.2 2.3 1,07 2 2.0,07 2 2.0,07 2.2 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0 2.0	13 = 1 (P = 1 teroid SD 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 13.2 3.2 3 Chi ² = 3 Chi ² = 3	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) Total 41 124 15.00, d 8.84) Total 42 39 76 157 = 0.31) .49)	88 No Mean 95.7 95); I ² = 0 ^c No-S No-S 106.8 108.4 if = 2 (P No- No- 113.1 107.7 128.3); I ² = 14	11.6 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 37 80 <u>50tal</u> 42 124 1001); 1 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 45 42 124 125 125 125	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 38.1% 100.0% P = 94% Weight 16.5% 48.0% 100.0%	3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.40 (-10.21, 4.13) 1.40 (-10.35, 7.55) 1.427 (-5.83, 3.29) 1.427 (-5.83, 3.29) 1.430 (-10.42, 2.44) 1.400 (-10.42, 2.	-10 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -20 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 85% CI -20 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI -20 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] -20 -20 -20 -20 -20 -20 -20 -20	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S Mean. 93,7 95 0.17, df 4 100,7 2 = 0.65 S Kt Mean 104 110,7 105,6 20.33; C Z = 0.09 S S Mean 111,5 108,5 2 = 0.5 S Mean 111,5 102,1 2 = 0.5 S Mean 111,5 102,1 2 = 0.5 S Mean 111,5 102,1 2 = 0.5 S Mean 111,5 S Mean 111,5 S Mean 111,5 S Mean 111,5 S Mean 111,5 S Mean 115,5 Mean 115,5 Mean 111	13 = 1 (P = i teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = i 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = i 13.8 3.2 3.2 3.2 (P = c Eroid <u>SD</u> 10.5 12.55 10.7 = 2 (P = i (P = c Eroid SD 10.5 12.55 10.7 (P = c Eroid SD 10.5 12.55 10.7 (P = c Eroid SD 10.5 12.55 10.7 (P = c Eroid SD 10.5 12.55 10.7 (P = c Eroid SD 10.5 12.55 10.7 (P = c Eroid SD 10.5 10.5 10.7 (P = c SD 10.5 10.5 10.7 (P = c SD 10.5 10.5 10.7 (P = c SD 10.5 10.5 10.7 (P = c SD 10.5 10.7 (P = c SD 10.5 10.5 10.7 (P = c SD 10.5 10.5 10.7 (P = c (P =	38 114 = 0.54 0.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 0.59) 124 45 5.00, d 84) 124 45, 500, d 84) 124 124 157 76 = 0.31) 149)	88 No Mean 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid 9.7 15.3 12.5 % Steroid SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 %	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 5 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 43 37 76 156	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 100.0% Weight 16.5% 100.0% Weight 10.0%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference . V. Fixed, <u>95% C1</u> . 2.00 (-7, 23, 72] 0.00 (-7, 55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, <u>95% C1</u> . 4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) . 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) . 2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference <u>IV. Fixed, <u>95% C1</u> . 1.60 (-5.90, 2.70) . 2.80 (-0.90, 6.50) 0.91 (-1.65, 3.47) Mean Difference <u>IV. Random, <u>95%</u> C1 . 2.80 (-0.90, 6.50) 0.91 (-1.65, 3.47) Mean Difference</u></u></u>	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 St Mean. 93.7 95 0.17, df 102, df 102, df 102, df 20.33; C 2 = 0.20 C 33; C 2 = 0.20 St Mean 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C 2 = 0.20 St Mean 131.1 2.31, df 2 = 0.69 St Mean 117, 2	13 = 1 (P = 1 teroid <u>SD</u> 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 10.5 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 10.5 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 9 9	38 114 = 0.54 1.28) Totall 42 38 80 = 0.68; 0.59) fotal 1 124 45.00, d 45 41 124 45.00, d 84) Totall 42 39 76 = 0.31) 849) Totall 42 849 8	88 No Mean 95.7	11.6 Steroid SD 1 13.1 17.4 (solution) (solution	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 37 45 42 124 124 10001); 1 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 76 156	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 25.5% 100.0%	3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.75, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI. 3.90 [2.17, 563] -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 [-6.09, 4.96] Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI. 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.91 [-1.65, 3.47] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI. 0.91 [-1.65, 0.55] 0.91 [-1.65, 0.55]	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Exed. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI Mean Difference IV. Fixed. 95% CI Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 % Maan. 93.7 95 0.17, df : 2 = 0.55 2 = 0.55 2 = 0.55 2 = 0.20 % Mean. 110.5 2 0.33; C Z = 0.20 % Mean. 110.5 3 1.11 2.31, df = 2 Z = 0.69 % % Mean. 112.4 112.4	13 = 1 (P = 1 teroidd SD 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 eroid SD 10.5 10.7 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 eroid SD 10.5 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 9 12.1 	38 114 2.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 80 = 0.68 0.59) Total 124 42 38 45 41 124 42 39 76 157 = 0.31) 1.49) Total	88 Noo Mean 108 108.4 113.1 107.7 128.3 1, l ² = 14 NoS Mean 113.1 107.7 128.3 No-S	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 SC SD 13.1 17.4 SC SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 Steroid SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 % Steroid SD 7.6 10.3	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 5 5 6 124 124 124 124 124 1001); 1 42 124 124 156 156	23.0% 100.0% Weight 63.5% 30.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 25.5% 48.0%	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference W. Eixed, 95% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. 4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI. 1.60 (-5.90, 2.70) 2.80 (-3.90, 6.50) 0.91 (-1.65, 3.471) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. -3.00 (-5.50, 0.55) -3.00 (-5.50, 1.55) -3.00 (-5.5	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, Cl Hean Differen	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S Mean 93.7 95 0.17, df 4 2 = 0.55 Stt Mean 104 110.7 2 = 0.20 St Mean 111.5 2 = 0.20 St Mean 111.2 2 = 0.55 St Mean 111.2 2 = 0.20 St Mean 111.2 2 = 0.20 St Mean 111.2 2 = 0.20 St 112.4 1112.4 112.	13 = 1 (P (r (P = 1)) teroid 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P (SD) 13. 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 3.2 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0) teroid SD (P = 0) teroid	38 114 2.28) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68 3.59) Total 124 41 38 45 41 124 42 39 76 157 76 = 0.31) 764 157 764 157 765 157 157 157 157 157 157 157 15	88 No No No-S No No-S No No-S No-S No No-S No No-S No No-S No No-S No No-S No-	11.6 Steroid SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid SD 7.6 SD 7.6 SD 10.3 5 10.3 5 10.3 5 10.3 5 10.3 5 10.3 5 10.3	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 80 <u>7otal</u> 43 37 45 42 124 10001); 1 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 6 156	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0%		Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 % Mean 93.7 95 0.17, df df 22 = 0.55 Ste Mean 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 St Mean 111.5 108.5 131.1 117.2 St Mean 117.2 St Mean 117.2 St Mean 117.2 St Mean 117.2 St Mean 111.5 117.4 117.2 St Mean 117.4 117.2 St Mean 111.5 117.4	$\begin{array}{r} 1.3\\ = 1 \ (P = 1)\\ \hline (P = 1)\\ \hline (P = 1)\\ \hline SD\\ 15.9\\ = 1 \ (P = 1)\\ \hline SD\\ 15.9\\ = 1 \ (P = 1)\\ \hline (P = $	38 114 2.28) Total 1 42 38 80 0.59) 124 45 0.59) 124 45 45 41 124 45 0.68) 76 157 76 157 76 157 124 42 39 76 157 124 157 124 157 124 157 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124	88 Noo 95,7 95,	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 dd Total 43 37 80 5 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 38.1% 24.2% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 48.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 48.0% 100.0% 24.2% 22.6%	3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.40 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.41 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.41 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.41 (-1.21, 4.13) 1.41 (-1.41, 4.13) 1.41 (-1.	Hean Difference IV. Eixed, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Eixed, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 85% CI Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random State IV. Random St	
0.38, df X = 1.07 X = 1.07 X = 93.7 95 0.17, df 1 X = 0.55 Sto Mean 104 110.7 105.6 20.33; C Z = 0.20 Sto Mean 111.5 108.5 112.5 111	13 = 1 (P = 1 r (P = 1 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 r (P = 0	38 114 20.28) Total 42 38 42 38 42 38 45 5.50, 6 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	88 88 88 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 15.3 12.5 % Steroid SD 15.3 12.5 % Steroid 15.3 15.3 15.3 17.4 % SD 17.4 17.4 % SD 17.3 17.4 SD 17.3 17.3 15.3 17.3 15.3 12.5 15.3 10.4 10.3 15.3 10.3 15.3 10.3 10.5 10.3 10.5 10.3 10.5 10.3 10.5 10.3 10.5 10.3 10.5 10.5 10.5 10.3 10.5	37 113 dd Total 43 37 80 50tal 43 37 80 50tal 43 37 45 42 124 42 124 43 37 76 156 43 37 76 156	23.0% 100.0% Weightt 24.2% 36.5% 100.0% Weightt 35.5% 100.0% Weightt 25.9% 27.3% 27.4% 27.3% 27.3% 27.4% 27.3% 27.4% 27.3% 27.4% 27.3% 27.4% 27.3% 27.4% 27.4% 27.3% 27.4%	. 3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference . 2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI . 4.00 [-10.94, 2.94] . 3.90 [21.75, 63] . 4.01 [-10.94, 2.94] . 3.90 [-10.94, 2.94] . 4.02 [-10.94] . 4.04 [-1	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl	
0.38, cff 2 = 1.07 Maan 93.7 95 0.17, cff 102, 7 102, 7 105, 6 20.33, C 2 = 0.20 St Maan 104 110, 7 2 = 0.20 St Maan 104 105, 6 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 7 105, 6 105, 7 105, 7 111, 5 111, 7 112, 4 112, 4 115, 7 112, 4 115, 7 112, 4 115, 7 112, 4 115, 7 115, 7 1	13 = 1 (P = 1 T (P = 1 SD 5 (P = 1 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 SD 13.3 3.2 3.2 3.2 (P = 0 SD 10.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 SD 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 SD 12.5 12.5 12.5 9 12.1 12.5 9 12.1 12.5 9 12.1 12.5 9 12.1 12.5 9 12.5 15.5 12.5 15.5 12.5 15.5 12.5 15.5 12.5 15.5 1	38 114 2.55, 0, d 38 2.28) Total 42 38 42 38 42 38 45 41 124 45 5.00, d 845 41 124 42 39 76 157 = 0.31) 1.49) Total 42 38 164 42 38 164 42 38 164 42 38 164 42 38 164 164 164 164 164 164 164 164	88 88 88 80 80 80 80 80 80 80	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid 9.7 15.3 12.5 SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 SD 9.7 15.3 12.5	37 113 d Total 37 80 5 42 124 1001); l 43 37 45 42 124 1001); l 156 156 156 156	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 37.7% 24.2% 37.7% 100.0% Weight 15.5% 100.0% Weight 15.5% 48.0% 100.0% Weight 15.5% 24.2% 27.2% 27.3% 22.6% 22.2% 23.2% 22.2% 23.2% 22.2% 23.2% 22.2% 23.2% 2	3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference (V. Fixed. 95% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.75, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference (V. Faxed. 95% CI. -3.00 (-4.55, 7.56) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference (V. Faxed. 95% CI. -3.00 (-6.55, 0.57) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) Mean Difference (V. Faxed. 95% CI. -3.00 (-6.55, 0.55) -0.10 (-5.14, 3.47) Mean Difference (V. Faxed. 95% CI. -3.00 (-6.55, 0.55) -0.10 (-5.14, 3.47) Mean Difference (V. Faxed. 95% CI. -3.00 (-6.55, 0.55) -0.10 (-5.14, 3.947) -5.00 (-11.29, 1.29) -5.00 (-12.9, 1.29)	-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Exed. 95% CI -10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -10 -5 0 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -10 -5 0 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -10 -5 0 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random. 95% CI -10 -5 0 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
0.38, cfi Z = 1.07 <u>S</u> 93.7 95 0.17, df if 2 = 0.55 <u>Stet</u> <u>Mean</u> 104 110.7 102.6 20.33; C 2 = 0.20 <u>Stet</u> <u>Mean</u> 111.5 108.5 131.1 117.2 112.4 115 2 = 0.05	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 13 3.2 3 2hi ² = 3 (P = 0 50 10.5 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 12.1 3.4 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 10.5 12.5 13.4 15.9 15	38 114 124 0.28) Total 1 42 38 80 = 0.68 3.59) Total 1 42 38 41 42 38 42 38 45 41 124 45 39 76 157 154 194 42 39 76 155, d 45 104 45 38 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45 45	88 88 No Mean 95.7 95 95 95 95 108 108 108 108 108 108 108 108	11.6 % Steroid 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 13.7 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroi SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 % Steroid SD 0.7 5 10.3 17.4 %	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 37 45 42 124 0001); l d Total 43 37 76 156 156 156 156 162 001); l	23.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% 100.0% Weight 100.0% 24.2% 100.0% 10	. 3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] 1.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference W. Eixed, 95% CI. -2.00 [-7.72, 3.72] 0.00 [-7.55, 7.55] -1.27 [-5.83, 3.29] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. 3.90 [217, 5.63] -3.00 [-1.09, 4, 2.94] -3.00 [-1.09, 4, 2.94] -0.57 [-6.09, 4.96] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI. 1.60 [-5.50, 2.70] 2.80 [-0.30, 6.50] 0.91 [-1.65, 3.47] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. -3.00 [-5.50, 55] -3.00 [-5.50, 4.4, 844] 7.60 [6.03, 9.77] 0.19 [-6.79, 7.17]	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 85%, CI Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, CI Favours [control] Favours [control] Favour	
0.038, df Z = 1.07 S Maan, 93,7 95 0,17, df Z = 0.55 Stu Maan 104 110,7 105,6 20,33; C Z = 0.20 Stu Maan 111,5 20,33; C Z = 0.20 Stu Maan 111,5 2,5 3,1,1 111,5 108,5 113,1 111,5 12,5 12,5 12,5 12,5 12,5 12,5 1	13 = 1 (P 7 (P = 1) 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 6 (P = 0 13 3.2 3 2hi ² = 3 (P = 0 2 (P = 0 10.5 12.5 10.7 10.5 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 9 9 12.1 3.4 15.9 hi ² = 4 (P = 0 hi ² = 4 (P = 0 13.4 15.9 9 12.1 13.4 15.9 10.5	38 114 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	88 88 95,7 = 0 95,7 = 9 95,7 = 9 95 108 108,4 108,4 108,4 108,4 113,1 114,1 120,1 12	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 % teroid SD 13.7 < 0.00 Steroid SD 7.6 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.5 15.3 12.5 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.5 (SD 7	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 37 45 42 124 1001); 43 37 45 37 76 156 156 156 156 162 162 170 162 170 162 170 163 170 163 170 163 170 163 170 163 170 163 170 170 170 170 170 170 170 170	23.0% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 100.0%	3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV. Fixed 35% CI. -2.00 (-7.72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7.75, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. 4.00 (-10, 42, 54) 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.36) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.36) Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI. -0.57 (-6.09, 4.36) 0.80 (-5.50, 7.10) 0.80 (-5.50, 5.50) -0.10 (-5.50, 3.47) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. -3.00 (-6.55, 0.55) -3.01 (-1.65, 0.55) -0.10 (-5.4, 3.47) Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI. -3.00 (-6.55, 0.55) -0.10 (-5.4, 3.47) -5.00 (-1.129, 1.29) 0.19 (-6.79, 7.17) Mean Difference	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [control] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [control] Favours [control]	
0.38, cfr Z = 1.07 Standard Standard St	13 = 1 (P = 1 r (P = 1 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 6 SD 1 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = 0 SD 1 13 (P = 0 (P = 0 (P = 0 (P = 0 SD 1 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 SD 1 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 (P = 0 SD 1 12.5 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P = 0 SD 1 12.5 13.4 15.9	38 114 124 0.28) Total 1 42 38 80 = 0.68 38 45 .0.59) Total 1 124 15.00, d 8.84) Total 124 15.00, d 8.84) Total 124 15.00, d 8.84) Total 124 15.00, d 8.84) Total 15.49) 15.49) 1	88 88 95,7 = 0 95,7 = 5 95 108,4 108,4 108,4 1108,4	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 SD 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid SD 9.7 12.5 SD 9.7 12.5 Steroid SD 12.5 Steroid Steroid Steroid 5 Steroid 5 ST 12.5 Steroid 5 ST 12.5 Steroid 5 Steroid 5 ST 5 5 5 3.7 Steroid 5 5 5 3.7 Steroid 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	37 113 d Total 37 80 37 80 37 45 42 42 124 124 124 124 124 124 156 156 156 156	23.0% Weight 63.5% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 24.2% 100.0% 16.5% 16.5% 48.0% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 25.9% 22.2% 100.0% Weight 25.9% 22.2% 100.0% Weight 25.9% 100.0% 1		Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95% CI Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 85% CI Mean Difference IV. Random S5% CI Mean Difference IV. Random S5% CI Mean Difference IV. Random S5% CI Mean Difference IV. Random S5% CI	
0.38, cff Z = 1.07 S Mean. 93.7 95 0.17, cff Z = 0.55 St Mean. 110.7 20.33; cf Z = 0.20 St Mean. 117.2 115 117.2 115 45.77; cff Z = 0.05 St Mean. 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 115 117.2 11	13 = 1 (P = i r (P = i sp) = 1 (P = i 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = i eroid sp) = 1 (P = i eroid 13 3.2 3 (P = c teroid sp) = 2 (P = c teroid sp) = 3 (P = c teroid sp) = (teroid sp) = (teroi	38 114 114 2028) Total 1 42 38 80 = 0.68 38 80 = 0.68 38 45 	88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 % Steroid SD 9.7 15.3 12.5 % Steroid SD 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid 3.4	37 113 dd <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 37 45 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 45 42 42 45 42 42 45 42 42 45 45 42 124 43 37 76 156	23.0% 23.0% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 27.3% 100.0% 22.2% 27.3% 100.0% 22.2% 27.3% 100.0% 22.3% 27.	. 3.00 (-2.57, 8.57) 1.46 (-1.21, 4.13) Mean Difference IV, Eixed, 95% CI, 2.00 (-7, 72, 3.72) 0.00 (-7, 52, 3.72) 0.00 (-7, 55, 7.55) -1.27 (-5.83, 3.29) Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI, 4.00 (-10.94, 2.94) 3.90 (2.17, 5.63) -2.80 (-4.25, -1.35) -0.57 (-6.09, 4.96) Mean Difference IV, Fixed, 95% CI, -3.00 (-5.50, 2.70) 2.80 (-6.39, 2.70) 0.91 (-1.65, 3.47) Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% C -3.00 (-5.50, 5.50) 0.19 (-1.4, 5.94) 7.500 (-1.29, 1.27) 0.19 (-6.79, 7.17) Mean Difference IV, Bandom, 95% CI, -3.00 (-5.50, 5.50) -3.00 (-5.50, 5.50) -3.00 (-5.50, 5.50) -3.00 (-5.50, 7.17) Mean Difference IV, Bandom, 95% CI, -3.00 (-5.50, 5.50) -3.00 (-1.20, 5.50) -3.00 (-5.50, 5.50) -	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Fixed, 35%, Cl Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference N. Randgm, 35%, Cl Heat Difference N. Randgm, 35%, Cl	
0.38, df Z = 1.07	13 = 1 (P (P = 1) teroid 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P (P = 1) 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P (P = 0) 10.5 10.7 12.5 10.7 = 2 (P (P = 0) (P = 0) 9 9 12.1 3.4 15.9 hP = 4 (P = 0) hP = 4 (P = 0) hP = 4 3.3 3.2 3.4 15.9 hP = 4 3.4 15.9 hP = 4 12.5 13.3 12.5 10.7 12.5 13.3 12.5 13.7 13.5 10.7 12.5 13.3 12.5 13.7 12.5 10.7 12.5 13.3 15.9 12.5 13.7 15.9 12.1 13.4 15.9	38 114 114 20.58) Total 42 38 80 = 0.68; 38 45 .59) Total 41 42 39 76 157 = 0.31) .49) Total 42 39 76 157 = 0.31) 42 38 42 38 41 42 38 41 42 38 41 42 38 41 41 42 38 45 38 45 50 66 80 41 42 42 38 41 42 42 38 41 42 42 38 41 42 42 42 38 41 42 42 42 42 42 42 41 42 42 42 42 41 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42	88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95 95	11.6 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 d 113 d 101al 43 37 80 37 80 6 10001); f 45 42 42 42 42 42 42 45 6 6 1001); f 101al 42 45 45	23.0% 100.0% Weight 100.0% 24.2% 36.5% 100.0% 24.2% 38.1% 100.0% P = 94% 100.0% Weight 100.0% Weight 48.0% 100.0% Weight 48.0% 100.0% Weight 48.0% 100.		-10 -5 Favours [experimental] Favours [experimental	
0.38, df Z = 1.07 S Mean. 93.7 95 0.17, df 102, 2 = 0.55 Str Mean. 104 110.7 105.6 20.33 C Z = 0.20 Str Mean. 111.5 108.5 131.1 12.3, df = 2 = 0.05 Str Mean. 112.4 115 123.5	13 = 1 (P = i r (P = i teroid 13.8 15.9 = 1 (P = c i (P = c) i (P =	38 114 114 20.54 38 80 142 38 80 80 80 80 80 164 150 105 105 105 105 105 105 105	88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88 88	11.6 Steroid SD 13.1 17.4 SC 13.7 17.3 5 3.7 < 0.00 Steroid SD 7.6 10.3 5 11.6 Steroid SD 3.4 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 3.7 (SD 9.7 7.5 5.5 12.5 (SD 9.7 7.5 5.5 12.5 (SD 9.7 7.5 5.5 12.5 (SD 9.7 7.5 5.5 11.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.5 5.5 11.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 7.6 (SD 9.7 7.6 (SD 7.7 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.7 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.7 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.7 (SD 7.6 (SD 7.7 (SD (SD (SD (SD (SD (SD (SD (SD (SD (SD	37 113 d Total 43 37 80 6 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124 124	23.0% 23.0% 24.2% 24.2% 36.5% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 100.0% 24.2% 100.0% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 24.2% 25.9% 25.9% 25.9% 25.9% 27.9%	. 3.00 [-2.57, 8.57] . 4.46 [-1.21, 4.13] Mean Difference 	Havours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Fixed, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, Cl Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, Cl Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Randgm, 95%, Cl	
0.38, eff Z = 1.07 Mean. 93.7 7 95 0.17, df 10.7 105.6 Z = 0.55 Sta Mean. 110.7 20.33; C Z = 0.20 20.32 C Z = 0.20 Sta Mean. 112, 2 108, 6 131, 1 2, 31, df 108, 6 131, 1 2, 31, df 108, 6 131, 1 2, 31, df 112, 2 0, 0 5 5 Mean. 112, 2 0, 0 5 112, 2 0, 0 5 112, 2 0, 0 5 112, 2 0, 0 5 112, 2 0, 0 5 112, 2 0, 0 5 112, 1 0, 0 112, 1 112, 11	$\begin{array}{r} 1.3 \\ = 1 \ (P \\ (P = 1) \\ \hline \\ 1.5 $	38 114 114 20 104 10 104 104 104 104 104 104	88 88 88 95.7 95.7 95.7 95.7 95.7 95.7 95.7 95.7	11.6 * * * * * * * * * * * * *	37 113 d <u>Total</u> 43 37 80 37 45 42 124 10001); 1 45 42 45 42 124 156 156 156 156 156 156 156 156 156 157 162 37 162 37 162 37 162	23.0% Weight 40.0% 40.0% 424.2% 36.5% 100.0% Weight 42.7% 42.7% 33.1% 100.0% Weight 45.5% 100.0% Weight 45.5% 22.6% 24.2% 45.5% 100.0% Weight 100.0% 1		-10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Exed, 95%, CI -20 -10 0 10 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, CI -10 -5 0 5 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, CI -20 -10 0 0 Favours [experimental] Favours [control] Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, CI -20 -10 0 0 Mean Difference IV. Random, 95%, CI -20 -10 0 Mean Difference -20 -10 0 Mean Difference -20 -10 0 Mean Difference -20 -10 0 -20 -10 0 -	
	s st Mean 78.1 1 75.5 63.8 67 5.71. df =1 2 = 13.11. 86.7 7 80.3 73 73 0.12. df f 2 = 7.51 80.3 73 0.12. df f 2 = 7.51 73 92.8 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 78 7	Steroid Mean SD 78.1 13.7 75.5 4.5 63.8 19.7 67 15.9 5.71, df = 3 (P + 2 Storoid 30.3 0.3 19.7 0.3 19.7 0.3 19.7 0.3 19.7 0.3 19.7 0.3 19.7 0.12, df = 2 (P 2 7.51 (P < C	$\begin{tabular}{l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l l $	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline $$ No-2$ \\ $	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c } \hline $No-Steroid$ $No-Stero$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c } \hline Steroid & Ste$	$\begin{tabular}{ c c c c c c c } \hline $$ No-Steroid $$ No-S$	Steroid No-Steroid Mean Difference 78.1 13.7 39 73.7 15.1 37 7.1% 4.40 (2.00, 10.80) 78.1 13.7 39 73.7 15.1 37 7.1% 4.40 (2.00, 10.80) 63.8 16.7 14.8 14.8 4.20 (2.00, 10.80) 16.7 63.8 16.7 14.8 14.4 4.40 (1.04, 14.32) 16.8 71.5 9.5 7.5 7.5 16.1 10.0.0% 11.57 (9.85, 13.30) 163 16.7 7.7 8.4 4.8% 10.00 (1.1, 7.89) 867 3.2 4.77 7.6 4.4 7.4% 10.83, 16.71 867 3.2 4.77 7.7 6.4 7.4% 0.30 (6.67, 11.38) 7.3 7.3 3.6 5.6 16.8 3.3% 0.00 (-0.16, 16.16) 7.3 7.3 8.6 7.6 7.6 4.6% 7.2 1.1.83 1.1.83 7.3 7.3 8.6 7.6 7.	Steroid No-Steroid Mean SD Total Wath Mask 20 Total Wath



.....

In this meta-analysis, significant improvement in ROM was observed during the early postoperative period in those patients who received steroid injections during surgery, but the effects subsequently vanished. We inferred that the analgesic effect is sufficient to suppress the postoperative pain caused by surgical trauma, which is consistent with achievement of early SLR and shorter LOS as verified by our results. The difference in ROM between steroids and the control groups was insignificant at the POW1, suggesting that the addition of steroidsto MCPI was unable to increase the ROM, which might be explained by its inability to eliminate postoperative fibrosis and scarring within their respective time frame. Likewise, we observed no improvement of KSS knee or functional scores, which is a comprehensive system rating both the knee prosthesis function and patients' functional abilities after TKA, at POW6. Three included RCTs reported the KSS scores. No group differences were noted in studies





Figure 4. Forest plot diagram showing postoperative morphine consumption (**a**), CRP at POD3 (**b**), the interval to perform SLR postoperatively (**c**), LOS (**d**), KSS knee score (**e**) and function score (**f**) at POW6.

conducted by Christian *et al.* and Kown *et al.*^{21,35}. Yue *et al.* observed significant improvement in postoperative KSSscores in the steroids group as compared with that in control groupat POM1 and POM3. However, at POM6, the KSS scores showed no significant difference between these two groups³⁶. All these results indicate that long term effects of steroids application on functional outcomes are still uncertain.

For safety concerns, many surgeons remain leery of using steroids that may increase the risk of catastrophic complications such as infection and patellar tendon rupture^{42,43}. A series of complications, including postoperative infection, wound oozing, PONV, pruritis, and transient peroneal nerve palsy were mentioned in the included studies. Our results indicate there were no difference in the total incidence of complications between the two groups. Steroids addition to MCPI would not increase the incidence of postoperative infection and PONV. Furthermore, there were no differences in the incidences of complicationsbetweenthe steroids and placebo groups. No case of tendon rupture was reported in the included RCTs.

Limitations of the present meta-analysis should also be acknowledged. Firstly, the sample size is relatively small and some of the indexes were objectively judged which may reduce the reliability of the study. The second limitation is the lack of consensus on the type and doses of the drugs applied in MCPI which also undermine the consolidation of the analysis. Third, some data were missing or could not be extracted. Some of the results appeared heterogeneous, and couldn't be eliminated by sensitivity or subgroup analyses. We included these high-quality studies and applied random-effect models for meta-analysis, which may mildly influence the

a. Total incidence	Steroid	1	No-Ster	oid		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	
Chia 2013	0	42	0	43		Not estimable		
Christian 2009	3	39	0	37	1.8%	7.19 [0.36, 144.17]	,	·
Ikeuchi 2014	1	20	4	20	14.5%	0.21 [0.02, 2.08]		
Kim 2015	0	43	0	45		Not estimable		
Kown 2014	19	76	19	76	54.4%	1.00 [0.48, 2.08]		
Ng 2011	0	41	0	42		Not estimable		
Pang 2008	2	45	2	45	7.3%	1.00 [0.13, 7.43]		
Seah 2011	1	29	1	30	3.6%	1.04 [0.06, 17.38]		
Tsukada 2016	8	38	6	37	18.3%	1.38 [0.43, 4.45]		
Yue 2013	0	36	0	36		Not estimable		
Total (95% CI)		409		411	100.0%	1.07 [0.63, 1.82]	+	
Total events	34		32					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	.70, df = 5	(P = 0)	.59); l ² =	0%				
Test for overall effect: Z	:= 0.24 (P	= 0.8	1)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
b. Infection	Chanala		No Stor	aid		Odda Patia	Odda Batia	
Study or Subgroup	Steroid	l Totol	No-Ster	Total	Moight	M L Eived 05% Cl		
Study or Subgroup	Events	20	Events	10(a)	AA 70/	WI-FI, FIXED, 95% CI	M-n. Fixed, 95% Cl	-
Christian 2009	1	39	0	37	14.7%	2.92 [0.12, 74.02]		
Pang 2008	2	45	2	45	57.0%	1.00 [0.13, 7.43]		
Sean 2011	1	29	1	30	28.3%	1.04 [0.06, 17.38]	T_	
Total (95% CI)		113		112	100.0%	1.29 [0.31, 5.38]		
Total events	4		3					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	.33, df = 2	(P = 0	0.85); l ² =	0%			0.01 0.1 1 10 100	
Test for overall effect: Z	: = 0.35 (P	= 0.72	2)				Favours [experimental] Favours [control]	
c. PONV	Steroi	d	No-Ste	roid		Odds Ratio	Odds Ratio	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	
Ikeuchi 2014	1	20	4	20	12.6%	0.21 [0.02, 2.08]		
Kim 2015	21	42	24	43	39.4%	0.79 [0.34, 1.86]	_	
Kown 2014	13	76	14	76	38.6%	0.91 [0.40, 2.10]	_	
Tsukada 2016	3	38	3	37	9.3%	0.97 [0.18, 5.15]		
Total (95% CI)		176		176	100.0%	0.78 [0.46, 1.34]	-	
Total events	38		45					
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	.46, df = 3	8 (P =)	0.69); l ² =	0%				+
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.89 (F	P = 0.3	7)				UUT U.T T 10 10	U
			27					

Complications

Figure 5. Forest plot diagram showing total incidence of complications (**a**), incidence of infection (**b**) and PONV (**c**) after knee joint arthroplasty.

.....

reliability of the results. Finally, the reported side effect is scarce and duration of follow-up is relatively short, which might lead to underestimation of complications and uncertainty of long-term efficacy⁴⁴. Despite the above limitations, this is the first meta-analysis that included RCTs to evaluate the efficiency and safety of periarticular steroids addition to MCPI in TKA and UKA. Large well-designed RCTs are still needed to validate this research moving forward.

In conclusion, this meta-analysis of RCTs suggested that the administration of periarticular steroids injection with MCPI appears to effectively relieve postoperative pain, improve functional outcomes, reduce morphine consumption, and decrease inflammatory reaction without causing a higher incidence of complications in the early postoperative period.

Methods

Search strategy. This quantitative meta-analysis was in accordance with the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses (PRISMA) guidelines⁴⁵. Two researchers searched the relevant studies independently including MEDLINE/PubMed database, the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL), and EMBASE databases from inception to April, 2018 for relevant RCTs that compared postoperative periarticular injection of steroids with placebo in the knee arthroplasty. Search terms included "knee", "arthroplasty," "replacement", "steroids," "corticosteroids," "cortisol", "cortisone", "dexamethasone", "glucocorticoid", "betamethasone", "hydrocortisone", "prednisolone", "ethylprednisolone", "riamcinolone", and "adrenal cortex hormone" (supplymentary files). Search terms were combined using the Boolean operators 'AND' or 'OR'. No restrictions were imposed, and reference lists of retrieved articles and reviews were also searched. A third reviewer acted as a judge if there was any disagreement.

Inclusion and exclusion criteria. Only RCTs comparing the clinical efficacy between postoperative periarticular or intraarticular injection of steroids with placebo among adults of any sex undergoing primary KA (including TKA, PKA, UKA, *et al.*) for any indication (osteoarthritis, rheumatoid arthritis, osteonecrosis or acute trauma) were included in our study. Studies that reported at least one outcome were included. The Primary outcomes being VAS and ROM. With secondary outcomes being morphine consumption, CRP, SLR, LOS, and KSS

Outcomes	Studies	No. of Patients	OR or MD (95% CI)	Heterogeneity (I ²), %	Р
VAS					
POD1	3	190	-1.52 (-2.94, -0.10)	82	0.04
POD3	2	110	-0.83 (-2.30, 0.64)	76	0.27
POW2	2	124	-0.42 (-1.19, 0.35)	14	0.29
ROM					
POD1	4	324	11.57 (9.85, 13.30)	47	< 0.00001
POD2	3	248	9.03 (6.67, 11.38)	0	< 0.00001
POD3	2	165	5.73 (0.85, 10.60)	44	0.02
POD4	2	165	5.53 (0.68, 10.38)	40	0.03
POD5	2	165	5.90 (0.87, 10.93)	0	0.02
POW1	2	227	1.46 (-1.21, 4.13)	0	0.28
POW2	2	160	-1.27 (-5.83, 3.29)	0	0.59
POW4	POW1	POW1	POW1	POW1	POW1
POW6	3	313	0.91 (-1.65, 3.47)	14	0.49
POM3	4	326	0.19 (-6.79, 7.17)	93	0.96
POM6	3	248	1.84 (-1.41, 5.08)	81	0.27
Morphine consumption	3	206	-7.94 (-14.35, -1.53)	73	0.02
CRP	2	123	-4.82 (-7.41, -2.23)	84	0.0003
SLR	3	282	-0.65 (-0.86, -0.44)	43	< 0.00001
LOS	2	159	-0/98 (-1.25, -0.71)	0	< 0.00001
KSS (POM6)			·		
Knee scores	2	228	0.54 (-0.64, 1.72)	0	0.37
Function scores	2	228	-2.47 (-11.62, 6.68)	56	0.60
Complications	10	820	1.07 (0.63, 1.82)	0	0.81
Infection	3	225	1.29 (0.31, 5.38)	0	0.72
PONV	4	352	0.78 (0.46, 1.34)	0	0.37

Table 3. Results of Meta-Analysis.

knee and function scores. Studies were excluded from present meta-analysis in view of incomplete data, letters, comments, editorials, case reports, conference abstracts, or review articles.

Data extraction. The relevant data was extracted from included studies by using a standard data extraction. Two researchers used this form to collect the information from studies independently. The main characteristics included the following items: first author's name, publication year, country, sample size, mean age, sex ratio, BMI, steroids intervention (dose and type), anesthetic techniques, perioperative analgesia intervention, and duration of follow-up. Other relevant data were extracted from included studies. Differences were resolved by consensus. If a study reported the outcomes of multiple doses of steroids for treatment, only data of the low dose group was extracted for analysis. The first main index was VAS score that has 11 pain levels (0 = no pain, 10 = extreme pain). All other types of VAS were converted to this 11 levels score according to ratio. The second index was ROM, composed of both flexion and extension angles of the knee. The flexion angle was used to represent ROM if flexion and extension angles cannot be combined. The third index contained the postoperative morphine consumption. The total amount of morphine consumption during hospitalization was accumulated for analysis. The other indexes included CRP, SLR, LOS, KSS knee and function scores, and complications. CRP is an acute-phase protein synthesized by the liver which reflects the postoperative inflammation⁴⁶. All the data on CRP were converted to the unit of mg/dl. SLR is a test-conducted post knee surgery to gauge how high a patient is able to elevate his/her leg off of an exam table, reflecting pain control as well as muscle strength recovery²⁶. KSS, composed of knee score and function score, is considered as an objective scoring system to rate the knee and patient's functional abilities such as walking and stair climbing before and after TKA⁴⁷. The total incidence of complications after surgery was calculated. If any special type of complication was mentioned more than twice, its incidence was pooled for subgroup analysis⁴⁸. For missing or incomplete data, we extracted information from diagrams or contacted the corresponding authors to ensure that the information was integrated. Otherwise, we estimated the data wherever possible using the recommendations in the Cochrane Handbook⁴⁹. Formats that were not suitable included studies reporting means with interquartile ranges, suggesting the data were non-normally distributed making conversion to means and SDs controversial⁴⁹. Furthermore, data only reporting means without SDs, standard errors (SEs) or confidence intervals (CIs) could not be extracted considering that one of these is required with the mean for meta-analysis.

Quality assessment. The risk of bias of the included studies was assessed using the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 5.1.0⁴⁹, based on the following items: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessment, incomplete outcome data, and selective reporting. The assessment items were either categorized as low risk of bias, high risk of

bias, or unclear risk of bias. Discrepancies between assessments were resolved by discussion with a third reviewer when necessary.

Statistical analysis. For continuous data, like VAS scores, ROM and so on, we calculated mean differences (MDs) and 95% CIs if outcomes were measured in the same way between studies, or we used the standardized mean differences (SMDs). Continuous data reported as means and ranges were transformed into means and SDs using Hozo's formula⁵⁰. Dichotomous data such as incidence of complications were expressed as odds ratios (ORs) with 95% CIs indicating the effect on intervention. Subgroup analysis was performed for different time points. The Q and chi-squared test were used to assess statistical heterogeneity with the value of *P* and *I*². If heterogeneity was low (P > 0.1, $I^2 < 50\%$), a fixed-effects model was used. If heterogeneity was significant (P < 0.1, $I^2 > 50\%$), a random-effects model was used. When possible, sensitivity and subgroup analyses were conducted to find the source of the heterogeneity. Publication bias was visually examined by funnel plots. We used Review Manager 5.2 software (Rev Man 5.2, The Cochrane Collaboration, Oxford, UK) and STATA, version 12.0 (Stata Corp LP, College Station, TX) to perform statistical analyses. P < 0.05 was considered statistically significant.

References

- 1. Lane, N. E. et al. OARSI-FDA Initiative: Defining the Disease State of Osteoarthritis. Osteoarthritis Cartilage. 19, 478-482 (2011).
- Heidari, B. Knee Osteoarthritis Prevalence, Risk Factors, Pathogenesis and Features: Part I. *Caspian J Intern Med.* 2, 205–212 (2011).
 Ethgen, O., Bruyere, O., Richy, F., Dardennes, C. & Reginster, J. Y. Health-Related Quality of Life in Total Hip and Total Knee Arthroplasty. A Qualitative and Systematic Review of the Literature. J. Bone Joint Surg. Am. 86-A, 963–974 (2004).
- Benazzo, F., Rossi, S. M. & Ghiara, M. Partial Knee Arthroplasty: Patellofemoral Arthroplasty and Combined Unicompartmental and Patellofemoral Arthroplasty Implants-General Considerations and Indications, Technique and Clinical Experience. *Knee*. 21(Suppl 1), S43–S46 (2014).
- 5. Parvizi, J., Miller, A. G. & Gandhi, K. Multimodal Pain Management After Total Joint Arthroplasty. J. Bone Joint Surg. Am. 93, 1075-1084 (2011).
- Dorr, L. D. & Chao, L. The Emotional State of the Patient After Total Hip and Knee Arthroplasty. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 463, 7–12 (2007).
- Barrington, J. W., Lovald, S. T., Ong, K. L., Watson, H. N. & Emerson, R. J. Postoperative Pain After Primary Total Knee Arthroplasty: Comparison of Local Injection Analgesic Cocktails and the Role of Demographic and Surgical Factors. J. Arthroplasty. 31, 288–292 (2016).
- Joo, J. H., Park, J. W., Kim, J. S. & Kim, Y. H. Is Intra-Articular Multimodal Drug Injection Effective in Pain Management After Total Knee Arthroplasty? A Randomized, Double-Blinded, Prospective Study. J. Arthroplasty. 26, 1095–1099 (2011).
- Zhou, Y. et al. Single-Dose Intra-Articular Ropivacaine After Arthroscopic Knee Surgery Decreases Post-Operative Pain without Increasing Side Effects: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc. 24, 1651–1659 (2016).
- Zeng, C. et al. Single-Dose Intra-Articular Morphine After Arthroscopic Knee Surgery: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Placebo-Controlled Studies. Arthroscopy. 29, 1450–1458 (2013).
- Wei, J., Yang, H. B., Qin, J. B., Kong, F. J. & Yang, T. B. Single-Dose Intra-Articular Bupivacaine After Knee Arthroscopic Surgery: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Placebo-Controlled Studies. *Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc.* 22, 1517–1528 (2014).
- Fan, Z. et al. The Efficacy of Dexamethasone Reducing Postoperative Pain and Emesis After Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Int. J. Surg. 52, 149–155 (2018).
- Gilron, I. Corticosteroids in Postoperative Pain Management: Future Research Directions for a Multifaceted Therapy. Acta Anaesthesiol. Scand. 48, 1221–1222 (2004).
- Pang, H. N., Lo, N. N., Yang, K. Y., Chong, H. C. & Yeo, S. J. Peri-Articular Steroid Injection Improves the Outcome After Unicondylar Knee Replacement: A Prospective, Randomised Controlled Trial with a Two-Year Follow-Up. J. Bone Joint Surg. Br. 90, 738–744 (2008).
- Holte, K. & Kehlet, H. Perioperative Single-Dose Glucocorticoid Administration: Pathophysiologic Effects and Clinical Implications. J. Am. Coll. Surg. 195, 694–712 (2002).
- Sculco, P. K. & Pagnano, M. W. Perioperative Solutions for Rapid Recovery Joint Arthroplasty: Get Ahead and Stay Ahead. J. Arthroplasty. 30, 518–520 (2015).
- Jules-Elysee, K. M. et al. Use of Low-Dose Steroids in Decreasing Cytokine Release During Bilateral Total Knee Replacement. Reg. Anesth. Pain Med. 36, 36–40 (2011).
- McLawhorn, A. S. et al. Effects of Steroids On Thrombogenic Markers in Patients Undergoing Unilateral Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Prospective, Double-Blind, Randomized Controlled Trial. J. Orthop. Res. 33, 412–416 (2015).
- Bergeron, S. G., Kardash, K. J., Huk, O. L., Zukor, D. J. & Antoniou, J. Perioperative Dexamethasone Does Not Affect Functional Outcome in Total Hip Arthroplasty. *Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res.* 467, 1463–1467 (2009).
- Jules-, E. K. *et al.* Steroid Modulation of Cytokine Release and Desmosine Levels in Bilateral Total Knee Replacement: A Prospective, Double-Blind, Randomized Controlled Trial. *J. Bone Joint Surg. Am.* 94, 2120–2127 (2012).
- Christensen, C. P., Jacobs, C. A. & Jennings, H. R. Effect of Periarticular Corticosteroid Injections During Total Knee Arthroplasty. A Double-Blind Randomized Trial. J. Bone Joint Surg. Am. 91, 2550–2555 (2009).
- Liu, G., Gong, M., Wang, Y. & Xiang, Z. Effect of Methylprednisolone on Pain Management in Total Knee or Hip Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin. J. Pain.* 34, 967–974 (2018).
- Li, X., Xu, G., Xie, W. & Ma, S. The Efficacy and Safety of Dexamethasone for Pain Management After Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Int. J. Surg. 53, 65–71 (2018).
- 24. Mohammad, H. R. *et al.* Perioperative Adjuvant Corticosteroids for Postoperative Analgesia in Knee Arthroplasty. *Acta Orthop.* **89**, 71–76 (2018).
- Meng, J. & Li, L. The Efficiency and Safety of Dexamethasone for Pain Control in Total Joint Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 96, e7126 (2017).
- Tran, J. & Schwarzkopf, R. Local Infiltration Anesthesia with Steroids in Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review of Randomized Control Trials. J Orthop. 12, S44–S50 (2015).
- 27. Zhao, X. *et al.* Efficacy of Steroid Addition to Multimodal Cocktail Periarticular Injection in Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Meta-Analysis. J. Orthop. Surg. Res. 10, 75 (2015).
- 28. Cui, Z. et al. The Efficacy of Steroid Injection in Total Knee Or Hip Arthroplasty. Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc. 23, 2306–2314 (2015).
- 29. Xing, D. *et al.* Dose Intraarticular Steroid Injection Increase the Rate of Infection in Subsequent Arthroplasty: Grading the Evidence through a Meta-Analysis. *J. Orthop. Surg. Res.* 9, 107 (2014).
- Witjes, S. et al. Return to Sports and Physical Activity After Total and Unicondylar Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. Sports Med. 46, 269–292 (2016).

- Pollock, M., Somerville, L., Firth, A. & Lanting, B. Outpatient Total Hip Arthroplasty, Total Knee Arthroplasty, and Unicompartmental Knee Arthroplasty: A Systematic Review of the Literature. *JBJS Rev.* 4 (2016).
- 32. Chughtai, M. et al. Cryotherapy Treatment After Unicompartmental and Total Knee Arthroplasty: A Review. J. Arthroplasty. 32, 3822–3832 (2017).
- Tsukada, S., Wakui, M. & Hoshino, A. The impact of including corticosteroid in a periarticular injection for pain control after total knee arthroplasty: a double-blind randomised controlled trial. *Bone Joint J.* 98-B, 194–200 (2016).
- 34. Kim, T. W. et al. Which analgesic mixture is appropriate for periarticular injection after total knee arthroplasty? Prospective, randomized, double-blind study. *Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc.* 23, 838–845 (2015).
- Kwon, S. K., Yang, I. H., Bai, S. J. & Han, C. D. Periarticular injection with corticosteroid has an additional pain management effect in total knee arthroplasty. Yonsei Med. J. 55, 493–498 (2014).
- Yue, D. B., Wang, B. L., Liu, K. P. & Guo, W. S. Efficacy of multimodal cocktail periarticular injection with or without steroid in total knee arthroplasty. *Chin. Med. J. (Engl.).* 126, 3851–3855 (2013).
- Ikeuchi, M. et al. Effects of dexamethasone on local infiltration analgesia in total knee arthroplasty: a randomized controlled trial. Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc. 22, 1638–1643 (2014).
- Chia, S. K. *et al.* Peri-articular steroid injection in total knee arthroplasty: a prospective, double blinded, randomized controlled trial. J. Arthroplasty. 28, 620–623 (2013).
- Sean, V. W. *et al.* Single-dose periarticular steroid infiltration for pain management in total knee arthroplasty: a prospective, doubleblind, randomised controlled trial. *Singapore Med. J.* 52, 19–23 (2011).
- 40. Ng, Y. C. *et al.* Effects of periarticular steroid injection on knee function and the inflammatory response following Unicondylar Knee Arthroplasty. *Knee Surg. Sports Traumatol. Arthrosc.* **19**, 60–65 (2011).
- 41. Creamer, P. Intra-articular corticosteroid injections in osteoarthritis: do they work and if so, how? Ann. Rheum. Dis. 56, 634–636 (1997).
- 42. Marsland, D., Mumith, A. & Barlow, I. W. Systematic review: the safety of intra-articular corticosteroid injection prior to total knee arthroplasty. *Knee.* 21, 6–11 (2014).
- Sauerland, S., Nagelschmidt, M., Mallmann, P. & Neugebauer, E. A. Risks and benefits of preoperative high dose methylprednisolone in surgical patients: a systematic review. Drug Saf. 23, 449–461 (2000).
- 44. Cutolo, M. et al. Use of glucocorticoids and risk of infections. Autoimmun Rev. 8, 153-155 (2008).
- Liberati, A. et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate health care interventions: explanation and elaboration. J. Clin. Epidemiol. 62, e1–34 (2009).
- 46. Pepys, M. B. & Hirschfield, G. M. C-reactive protein: a critical update. J. Clin. Invest. 111, 1805–1812 (2003).
- 47. Scuderi, G. R. et al. The new Knee Society Knee Scoring System. Clin. Orthop. Relat. Res. 470, 3–19 (2012).
- 48. Deng, Z. H. *et al.* Topical diclofenac therapy for osteoarthritis: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Clin. Rheumatol.* **35**, 1253–1261 (2016).
- 49. Julian, H. & Sally, G. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions (2011).
- Hozo, S. P., Djulbegovic, B. & Hozo, I. Estimating the mean and variance from the median, range, and the size of a sample. BMC Med. Res. Methodol. 5, 13 (2005).

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81874030), the Guangdong Province Science and Technology R&D project planning (No. 2014A020212656), the Provincial Science Foundation of Hunan (No. 2015JJ3139) and China Scholarship Council (student ID: 201606370164 and 201606375101).

Author Contributions

All authors had full access to the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and theaccuracy of the data analysis. Y.S.L., W.L., S.S.G. and Z.H.D. were responsible for conception and design of the study and drafted the manuscript. Z.H.D., Y.S.L., X.Y.S. and G.H.L. contributed to data collection. R.N.K. and G.R.S. contributed to language editing. Z.H.D. contributed to manuscript preparation and data analysis. Z.H.D. and S.S.G. contributed to study retrieval. W.L., Y.S.L. and Z.H.D. contributed to revision of the manuscript. All the authors contributed to the interpretation of the data and critically reviewed the manuscript for publication.

Additional Information

Supplementary information accompanies this paper at https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-019-43540-9.

Competing Interests: The authors declare no competing interests.

Publisher's note: Springer Nature remains neutral with regard to jurisdictional claims in published maps and institutional affiliations.

Open Access This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/.

© The Author(s) 2019