



Bilag 6 – AMSTAR vurderinger

NKA for brug af paracetamol, NSAID og opioider til behandling af akutte lænderygsmærter hos voksne

| | |
|-------------------------|---|
| Van der Gaag, 2002..... | 2 |
| Wewege, 2023..... | 4 |
| Saragiotto, 2016..... | 6 |

Van der Gaag, 2002

Reference: van der Gaag WH, Roelofs PDDM, Enthoven WTM, van Tulder MW, Koes BW. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs for acute low back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020;2020(4):

Overordnet vurdering: High quality review

| Spørgsmål | Vurdering (yes, partial yes, no) |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO? | Yes |
| 2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? | Partial yes |
| 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? | Yes |
| 4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? | Yes |
| 5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? | Yes |
| 6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? | Yes |
| 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? | Yes |
| 8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? | Yes |
| 9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? | Yes |
| 10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review? | Yes |
| 11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? | Yes |
| 12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis? | Yes |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review? | Yes |
| 14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review? | Yes |
| 15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? | Yes |
| 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review? | Yes |

Wewege, 2023

Reference: Wewege MA, Bagg MK, Jones MD, Ferraro MC, Cashin AG, Rizzo RR, et al. Comparative effectiveness and safety of analgesic medicines for adults with acute non-specific low back pain: systematic review and network meta-analysis. BMJ. 2023;380:e072962

Overordnet vurdering: Low quality review

| Spørgsmål | Vurdering (yes, partial yes, no) |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO? | Yes |
| 2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? | Yes |
| 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? | Yes |
| 4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? | Yes |
| 5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? | Yes |
| 6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? | Yes |
| 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? | Yes |
| 8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? | Partial yes |
| 9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? | Yes |
| 10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review? | No |
| 11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? | Yes |
| 12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis? | No |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review? | Yes |
| 14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review? | No |
| 15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? | No |
| 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review? | No |

Saragiotto, 2016

Reference: Saragiotto BT, Machado GC, Ferreira ML, Pinheiro MB, Abdel Shaheed C, Maher CG. Paracetamol for low back pain. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2016

Overordnet vurdering: High quality review

| Spørgsmål | Vurdering (yes, partial yes, no) |
|--|----------------------------------|
| 1. Did the research questions and inclusion criteria for the review include the components of PICO? | Yes |
| 2. Did the report of the review contain an explicit statement that the review methods were established prior to the conduct of the review and did the report justify any significant deviations from the protocol? | Yes |
| 3. Did the review authors explain their selection of the study designs for inclusion in the review? | Yes |
| 4. Did the review authors use a comprehensive literature search strategy? | Yes |
| 5. Did the review authors perform study selection in duplicate? | Yes |
| 6. Did the review authors perform data extraction in duplicate? | Yes |
| 7. Did the review authors provide a list of excluded studies and justify the exclusions? | Yes |
| 8. Did the review authors describe the included studies in adequate detail? | Yes |
| 9. Did the review authors use a satisfactory technique for assessing the risk of bias (RoB) in individual studies that were included in the review? | Yes |
| 10. Did the review authors report on the sources of funding for the studies included in the review? | Yes |
| 11. If meta-analysis was performed did the review authors use appropriate methods for statistical combination of results? | Yes |
| 12. If meta-analysis was performed, did the review authors assess the potential impact of RoB in individual studies on the results of the meta-analysis or other evidence synthesis? | Yes |

| | |
|--|-----|
| 13. Did the review authors account for RoB in individual studies when interpreting/ discussing the results of the review? | Yes |
| 14. Did the review authors provide a satisfactory explanation for, and discussion of, any heterogeneity observed in the results of the review? | Yes |
| 15. If they performed quantitative synthesis did the review authors carry out an adequate investigation of publication bias (small study bias) and discuss its likely impact on the results of the review? | Yes |
| 16. Did the review authors report any potential sources of conflict of interest, including any funding they received for conducting the review? | Yes |