The Hierarchy of Evidence for Epidural Analgesia

The Hierarchy of evidence is based on summaries from the National Health and Medical Research Council (2009), the Oxford Centre for Evidence-based Medicine Levels of Evidence (2011) and Melynyk and Fineout-Overholt (2011).

Melbourne

- I Evidence obtained from a systematic review of all relevant randomised control trials.
- II Evidence obtained from at least one well designed randomised control trial.
- **III** Evidence obtained from well-designed controlled trials without randomisation.
- IV Evidence obtained from well designed cohort studies, case control studies, interrupted time series with a control group, historically controlled studies, interrupted time series without a control group or with case- series
- V Evidence obtained from systematic reviews of descriptive and qualitative studies
- VI Evidence obtained from single descriptive and qualitative studies
- VII Expert opinion from clinicians, authorities and/or reports of expert committees or based on physiology
- Melynyk, B. & Fineout-Overholt, E. (2011). *Evidence-based practice in nursing & healthcare: A guide to best practice (2nd ed.).* Philadelphia: Wolters Kluwer, Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.
- National Health and Medical Research Council (2009). *NHMRC levels of evidence and grades for recommendations for developers of guidelines* (2009). Australian Government: NHMRC.
 - http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/file/guidelines/evidence_statement_form.pdf
- OCEBM Levels of Evidence Working Group Oxford (2011). *The Oxford 2011 Levels of Evidence*. Oxford Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine. http://www.cebm.net/index.aspx?o=1025

.

Reference (include title, author, journal title, year of publication, volume and issue, pages)	Evidence level (I-VII)	Key findings, outcomes or recommendations
Shug, S. Palmer, G et al. Acute Pain Management: Scientific Evidence Fourth (2015) Edition Australian and New Zealand College of Anaesthetists and Faculty of Pain Medicine	1	Latest evidence and reviews by expert clinicians
Llewellyn, N and Moriarty, A. (2007) The national pediatric epidural audit. Pediatric Anesthesia 17, 520-533 Moriarty, A (2012) Pediatric epidural analgesia (PEA). 22 (1), 51-55	V	A prospective audit of children receiving epidural analgesia in Great Britain and Ireland, aiming to quantify the risks and adverse events. To establish the numbers of adverse events vs the number of epidurals performed
Walker et al (2012) Neuraxial analgesia in neonates and infants: A review of clinical and preclinical strategies for the development of safety and efficacy data. Anaesthesia and Analgesia. 115 (3), 638-662	V	The review and data evaluation of LA use in this cohort
Bravenboer-Monster, K. Keyzer-Dekker, C. et al. (2019) Efficacy of Epidural Analgesia after Laparotomy in Children. Eur. J. Pediatr. Surg, 29 (02): 209-214	111	Retrospective study looking at effect of post-operative epidural after laparotomy and the frequency of adverse events. Pain was assessed and data was collected on interventions, pain, complications and any adverse events. The data revealed the success or not based on pain, adverse events, side effects, opioid use and length of time the epidural remained in situ
Wong, G.K. et al. (2013) Major complications related to epidural analgesia in children: a 15 year audit of 3,152 epidurals. Can. J Anaesth 60 (4): 355-63	1V	A retrospective study in a single institution looking at complications and trying to identify incidents from all causes to look towards improving and reducing preventable complications The results showed an incidence of 7.6 complications per 1000 epidural infusions, similar to other published data. There were no know major complications identified. The most common being local infection and drug error. It was seen that these 58% were preventable complications

RCH anaesthesia and pain management	
department. Guidelines and education for	
regional and epidural analgesia	