University of Alberta

The Role of Ketorolac and Intravenous Opioids in the Post-Operative Pediatric Patient: A Systematic Review

> by Wendy Lynn Beaudoin

 (\mathbf{C})

A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Nursing

Faulty of Nursing

Edmonton, Alberta Fall 2006

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.



Library and Archives Canada

Published Heritage Branch

395 Wellington Street Ottawa ON K1A 0N4 Canada Bibliothèque et Archives Canada

Direction du Patrimoine de l'édition

395, rue Wellington Ottawa ON K1A 0N4 Canada

> Your file Votre référence ISBN: 978-0-494-22204-1 Our file Notre référence ISBN: 978-0-494-22204-1

NOTICE:

The author has granted a nonexclusive license allowing Library and Archives Canada to reproduce, publish, archive, preserve, conserve, communicate to the public by telecommunication or on the Internet, loan, distribute and sell theses worldwide, for commercial or noncommercial purposes, in microform, paper, electronic and/or any other formats.

The author retains copyright ownership and moral rights in this thesis. Neither the thesis nor substantial extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's permission.

AVIS:

L'auteur a accordé une licence non exclusive permettant à la Bibliothèque et Archives Canada de reproduire, publier, archiver, sauvegarder, conserver, transmettre au public par télécommunication ou par l'Internet, prêter, distribuer et vendre des thèses partout dans le monde, à des fins commerciales ou autres, sur support microforme, papier, électronique et/ou autres formats.

L'auteur conserve la propriété du droit d'auteur et des droits moraux qui protège cette thèse. Ni la thèse ni des extraits substantiels de celle-ci ne doivent être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans son autorisation.

In compliance with the Canadian Privacy Act some supporting forms may have been removed from this thesis.

While these forms may be included in the document page count, their removal does not represent any loss of content from the thesis. Conformément à la loi canadienne sur la protection de la vie privée, quelques formulaires secondaires ont été enlevés de cette thèse.

Bien que ces formulaires aient inclus dans la pagination, il n'y aura aucun contenu manquant.



Abstract

Managing post-operative pain in the pediatric population presents its own unique set of issues and concerns. Concern over the side effects and safety of opioids in the pediatric population can lead to a lack of adequate pain control. The purpose of this thesis is to examine the role of ketorolac (toradol), an intravenous non-steroidal anti-inflammatory, in the pain management of postsurgical pediatric patients.

The findings of this thesis research are presented in two manuscripts. The first manuscript contains a summary of the main findings of the systematic review and meta-analysis. The full systematic review is located in an appendix. Three main findings of the systematic review and meta-analysis are relevant. First, the belief that ketorolac poses a risk of post-operative bleeding is not supported. Second, ketorolac causes significantly less post-operative nausea and vomiting than the current gold standard of intravenous opioids. And third, ketorolac is found to be equivalent to intravenous opioids for mild to moderate pain, and as such is a reasonable alternative.

The topic of the second manuscript is finding evidence. It is written for nurse practitioners and deals with the approach to take to pose clear clinical questions. Sources for high quality systematic reviews are provided.

The discussion section of the thesis deals with the value of systematic reviews and meta-analysis. Research dealing with infrequent events and using small samples may produce biased results. A meta-analysis, which combines studies and increases sample size, will provide stronger evidence than single studies. They can guide practitioners to make informed decisions for their patients in an efficient and effective manner while avoiding small event size bias.

This research dealt with administration of drugs for pain. Many different methods of observing and recording pain scores are used in pediatrics. It would be beneficial for future research if pain scales were standardized so that systematic review and meta-analysis could be carried out more efficiently. A systematic review about the safety, side effects and benefits of oral ketorolac when used for pain caused by day surgery would also be valuable.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dedication

I would like to dedicate this thesis all of my family and friends who have supported me through out this process. Dr Janice Lander has been my inspiration for this project and any that may come in the future. She has repeatedly given me priceless advice and counseling to keep me on the right track. Dr Alex Clark and Dr Ramona Kearney who graciously agreed to sit on my thesis committee and have lent support and invaluable guidance in helping me complete this process.

To my parents whose unwavering belief that I can achieve greater things than I ever could have dreamed for myself, have made me who I am today academically, professionally and personally. There will never be enough words to thank-you.

To my amazing husband, Brett, and beautiful girls, Olivia and Mackenzie: Brett you are the corner stone of all things great in my life. Olivia, you have repeatedly taught me that small things can have great ripples of effect. And Mackenzie who has taught me that if you put your head down and charge forward, you can over come any obstacle.

Thank you all so very much.

Table of Contents

Page

Introduction	
Background to the Research	1
Objectives	3
Manuscripts	4
Manuscript One	5
Manuscript Two	5
References	6
Manuscript One: Risks and Benefits of Intravenous Ketorolac in	
Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review and Meta-An	alysis
Abstract	
Introduction	11
Methods	12
Results	
Comment	19
References	
Manuscript Two: Systematically Improving Your Practice	
Abstract	51
Introduction	52
Asking the Right Clinical Question	53
Finding Systematic Reviews	54
Incorporating Systematic Reviews into Practice	56
Conclusions	58
References	59
General Discussion and Conclusions	60
Implications for Advanced Nurse Practitioners	61
Appendices	
A: Summary of Meta-analysis Findings	63

B: The Role of Ketorolac and Intravenous Opioid In the Post Operative......66 Pediatric Patient: A Systematic Review

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1-1 . Characteristics of Randomized Controlled Trials Comparing Intravenous Ketorolac with Intravenous Opioid or Placebo	29
Table A-1 Summary of Meta-analysis of Ketorolac vs. Opioids	113
Table A-2 Summary of Meta-analysis of Ketorolac vs Placebo	115
Table A-3 Characteristics of Excluded Studies	116
Table A-4 Characteristics of Included Studies	119

List of Figures

Page
Figure 1-1. Summary of Article Selection Process
Figure 1-2. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-3. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-4. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-5. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-6. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-7. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-8 . Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-9. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo
Figure 1-10. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo
Figure 1-11. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo40 Patients Requiring Post-Operative Blood Transfusions
Figure 1-12. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo41 Requiring Readmission to Hospital or Re-operation
Figure 1-13. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo42 Inpatients vs. Day Surgery
Figure 1-14. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - High Dose

Figure 1-15. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo
Figure 1-16. Bleeding – Gunter et al Study45
Figure 1-17 . Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting –46 Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure 1-18 . Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting –47 Ketorolac vs. Opioids – Day surgery patients vs. Inpatients
Figure 1-19 . Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting –48 Ketorolac vs. Opioids – High dose vs. Low dose ketorolac
Figure 1-20 . Time (in minutes) to Discharge from Recovery Room49 (PARR) – Ketorolac vs. Placebo
Figure 1-21 . Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Placebo50 Micrograms of Fentanyl Required in Recovery Room
Figure A-1. Summary of Article Selection Process
Figure A-2. Flow diagram of ketorolac versus opioid comparisons
Figure A-3. Flow diagram of ketorolac versus placebo comparisons90
Figure A-4. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
First Reported Pain Scores – Objective Pain Scale
First Reported Pain Scores – Objective Pain Scale Figure A-5. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
 First Reported Pain Scores – Objective Pain Scale Figure A-5. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
 First Reported Pain Scores – Objective Pain Scale Figure A-5. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
 First Reported Pain Scores – Objective Pain Scale Figure A-5. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Opioids

Figure A-10. Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-11. Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure A-12. Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-13. Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-14. Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-15. Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-16. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-17. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-18. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Bleeding Time138
Figure A-19. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-20. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-21. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids
Figure A-22. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-23. Gunter et al. Study143
Figure A-24. Maladaptive Behaviors – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –

Figure A-25. Maladaptive Behaviors – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –145 Abnormal Nighttime Sleeping Pattern
Figure A-26. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-27. Self Reported Pain Scales – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-28. Self Reported Bladder Spasms – Ketorolac vs. Placebo148
Figure A-29. Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-30. Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Opioids –
Figure A-31. Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-32. Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-33. Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-34. Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-35. Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-36. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-37. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-38. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –
Figure A-39. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –

Figure A-40. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –	30
Figure A-41. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –	51
Figure A-42. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo –	32

INTRODUCTION

A question that came up in my clinical practice was the stimulus for research reported in this thesis. Because one of our surgeons did not want to use opioids to manage post-operative pain in his pediatric patients, I looked for alternative drugs for moderate post-operative pain. This led me to look at the evidence relating to the use of intravenous non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs). I came to the conclusion that a systematic review with meta-analysis was required and that it would provide important information for clinical decisionmaking.

The topic of my master's thesis is the role of intravenous ketorolac (toradol) in the management of post-operative pediatric patients. The findings of my research have been presented in the *mixed paper format* option accepted by the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research of the University of Alberta. This format consists of two manuscripts to be submitted to journals for publication and an appendix containing the full systematic review written in the Cochrane style.

Background to the Research

Children often experience less than optimal pain management. Causes of inadequate pain control include hesitance about use of opioid analgesics, inability to provide analgesics in a timely manner, and failure to communicate evaluations of outcomes of pain treatments amongst staff (Dahl, 2002; Jacob & Puntillo, 2000; Rutledge, Donaldson, & Pravikoff, 2002).

Inadequate treatment of pain in children can have side effects involving the cardiovascular, respiratory, endocrine, metabolic, genitourinary,

gastrointestinal, and immune systems (McCaffery & Pasero, 1999). Children may also manifest cognitive and behavioral problems as a direct side effect of uncontrolled pain (Kain et al., 2004 Dec)

Drugs referred to as NSAIDs have been available for some time in preparations that can be taken orally or rectally. More recently, NSAIDs have become available for intravenous use (ketorolac, marketed as Toradol[™]) NSAIDs act as non-selective inhibitors of the cyclooxygenase, inhibiting both the cyclooxygenase-1 (COX-1) and cyclooxygenase-2 (COX-2) isoenzymes. Cyclooxygenase catalyzes the formation of prostaglandins and thromboxane from arachidonic acid. Prostaglandins act as messenger molecules in the process of inflammation.

NSAIDs have a role in post-operative pain management for pediatric patients. NSAIDs may replace intravenous opioids altogether for the treatment of mild to moderate pain or be used in conjunction with opioid analgesics for severe pain. However, pediatric practitioners are concerned about a risk of postoperative bleeding with the use of intravenous NSAIDs and are reluctant to use them routinely. Concern about these side effects coupled with the lack of comprehensive research surrounding intravenous NSAIDs in the pediatric population have lead to variations in prescription and administration practices.

Researchers have investigated the role of ketorolac for the management of pediatric pain. Study methods vary in terms of dosage used, duration of treatment and route of administration. Gunter et al (1995) reported hat a single dose increased major post-operative bleeding enough to suggest that ketorolac

is contraindicated in pediatric adenotonsillectomy patients. A systematic review and meta-analysis on the use of ketorolac following tonsillectomy was published in 2003 by Marret et al. their conclusion was that ketorolac not be used at all in any post-operative tonsillectomy patients. Concerns (Dsida, R. & Coté, C.J, 2004) have been raised over the quality of the Marret et al study and the method of data pooling used in their meta-analysis. Their search for studies for inclusion in the systematic review examined only two databases (MEDLINE and CCTR), excluded all non-english studies, and used a quality of study ranking system that eliminated studies thought to be of low quality. The seven studies included in their meta-analysis varied in methods and samples in significant ways: patient ages (adult and pediatric), route of administration (oral and parental), number or length of doses (one dose to two weeks of doses), and onset of NSAID treatment (upon completion of surgery to discharge home).

The evidence for use of intravenous ketorolac in pediatrics is not clear. Views about safety and efficacy of intravenous ketorolac are conflicting. No systematic review has been conducted to consider safety and efficacy of intravenous ketorolac for use across pediatric surgeries. A systematic review and meta-analysis is required to guide practice.

Objectives

<u>Objective 1:</u> To examine the side effects thought to be associated with the use of intravenous ketorolac in post-operative pediatric patients.

<u>Objective 2:</u> To determine the benefits of intravenous ketorolac in the postoperative pediatric patients, including pain control and the reduction of side effects associated with intravenous opioids.

<u>Objective 3:</u> To inform nurse practitioners about formulating an effective clinical question and finding appropriate systematic reviews to support their clinical practice.

Manuscripts

My research led to the development of two manuscripts and a report of the full systematic review in the Cochrane format. As a mixed-paper format has been used, both of the manuscripts have been developed for submission for publication. Since the manuscripts are formatted for submission to different journals, their styles vary. It should be noted that the first manuscript summarizes a portion of the findings of the full systematic review. The focus of the full systematic review is on pain as a primary outcome. Manuscript one takes a different perspective and focuses on bleeding, and nausea and vomiting as primary outcomes to highlight the more novel findings. A flow chart illustrating the analyses presented in manuscript 1 can be found in Appendix A. The full systematic review can be found in Appendix B with flow charts summarizing the full analyses (located on pages 94 to 96).

In summary, the manuscripts consist of:

- a focused systematic review and meta-analysis (Manuscript I)
- information for nurse practitioners on forming clinical questions and locating high quality systematic reviews (Manuscript II)

• A full systematic review and meta-analysis (Appendix B).

Each manuscript is briefly described below.

Manuscript One

The purpose of this paper was to summarize the methods of the systematic review and present the clinically relevant findings in a format that is suitable for publication in a medical journal. The three main conclusions of this paper are: 1) contrary to current belief, no greater risk of post-operative bleeding is associated with the use of intravenous ketorolac in the post-operative pediatric patient compared to opioids; 2) nausea and vomiting occurred significantly less in the intravenous ketorolac group than in the intravenous opioid group, and; 3) intravenous ketorolac and intravenous opioids provide similar post-operative pain control.

Manuscript Two

The second manuscript describes the need for nurse practitioners to become familiar with systematic reviews in order to provide the most up-to-date and relevant information to their patients. It illustrates the importance of and provides a method for formulating a clear clinical question when searching for quality research and information. The article provides practitioners with methods to locate systematic reviews from reputable sources and important clinical considerations when implementing the results of any systematic review.

References

- Dahl, J. L. (2002 Aug). Working with regulators to improve the standard of care in pain management: The U.S. experience. [review] [73 refs]. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management, 24*(2), 136-146.
- Dsida, R. & Coté, C.J.(2004) Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsillectomy: do we have the data? *Anesthesiology*.
 2004, 100(3):749-750.
- Gunter, J. B., Varughese, A. M., Harrington, J. F., Wittkugel, E. P., Patankar, S.
 S., & Matar, M. M., et al. (1995). Recovery and complications after tonsillectomy in children: A comparison of ketorolac and morphine.
 Anesthesia and Analgesia, 81(6), 1136-1141.
- Jacob, E., & Puntillo, K. A. (2000 Jul). Variability of analgesic practices for hospitalized children on different pediatric specialty units. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management, 20*(1), 59-67.
- Kain, Z. N., Caldwell-Andrews, A. A., Maranets, I., McClain, B., Gaal, D., &
 Mayes, L. C., et al. (2004 Dec). Preoperative anxiety and emergence
 delirium and postoperative maladaptive behaviors. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, *99*(6), 1648-1654.

Marret E, Antoine F, Samama CM, Bonnet F. Effects of postoperative, nonsteroidal, antiinflammatory drugs on bleeding risk after tonsillectomy: Metaanalysis of randomized, controlled trials. *Anesthesiology*. 2003;98:1497-1502.

- Marret, E. (2004). In reply to nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsillectomy: Do we have the data? *Anesthesiology*, *100*(3), 751-752.
- McCaffery, M., & Pasero, C. (1999). *Pain: Clinical manual* (2nd ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- Rutledge, D. N., Donaldson, N. E., & Pravikoff, D. S. (2002). Update: Pain assessment and documentation pediatrics part III. [Electronic version]. *The Online Journal of Clinical Innovations, 5*, 1-45.

MANUSCRIPT ONE

RISKS AND BENEFITS OF INTRAVENOUS KETOROLAC IN POST-OPERATIVE PEDIATRIC PATIENTS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS Abstract

Context: The use of intravenous ketorolac in the management of pediatric post operative pain is controversial, primarily because of concerns about risk of post-operative bleeding.

Objective: To determine the effect of intravenous ketorolac on post-operative bleeding, nausea and vomiting and pain control in comparison with intravenous opioids in post-operative pediatric patients.

Data Sources: 31 databases, including published and unpublished literature with no language restrictions using the key words *opioids, narcotics, morphine/ or morphine derivatives, dilaudid, hydromorphone, meperidine, pethidine, demerol, fentanyl, ketorolac tromethamine, ketorolac, toradol; and associated drug reference numbers* references of retrieved articles; and direct author contact.

Study Selection: From 88 retrieved articles, 15 randomized controlled trials were identified, comprising 1022 post-operative pediatric patients requiring intravenous medications for pain control.

Data Extraction: Data on post-operative bleeding, nausea and vomiting, pain scores, the need for "rescue" medication and time to discharge were extracted by two independent reviewers

Data Synthesis: Dichotomous data were analyzed and reported as a relative risk ratio (RR) with a 95% confidence interval. For analyses with significant heterogeneity ($l^2 < 50\%$), a random effects model was used as it is a more conservative estimate. Otherwise, a fixed effect model was used. Where small event rates occurred. Peto odds ratio was used with a fixed effects model. Continuous data were analyzed and reported as weighted means differences (WMD) where the units examined were similar. No significant difference in major post-operative bleeding events were found, however a decrease in milliliters of blood in post-operative drains was found in the ketorolac group (WMD= -3.20 ml; 95% CI -5.49 to -0.91). A significant decrease in the nausea and vomiting experienced by those who received ketorolac versus opioids was also found (RR,= 0.63; 95% CI, 0.51 to 0.77). Significantly less nausea and vomiting was also found in a subgroup analysis of strabismus repair patients (RR=28; 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53), day surgery patients (RR= 0.48; 95%; CI, 0.38 to 0.61), and those receiving high dose Ketorolac ($\geq 0.6 \text{ mg/kg}$) (RR= 0.63, 95%CI 0.51 to 0.78). No significant difference was found in time to discharge from recovery room or hospital, or in the need for "rescue" medications.

Conclusions: Intravenous ketorolac is a safe and effective alternative to opioid therapy for post-surgical pediatric patients. The risks of post-operative

bleeding commonly believed to be associated with ketorolac are not statistically supported. Any patient undergoing a surgery where post-operative emesis could be potentially detrimental to the surgical site should have ketorolac prescribed as a first line of defense for pain control as opposed to opioids.

RISKS AND BENEFITS OF INTRAVENOUS KETOROLAC IN POST-OPERATIVE PEDIATRIC PATIENTS: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW AND META-ANALYSIS

Clinicians who are caring for children's post-operative pain may find a role for non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAID). These may be the drugs of choice when clinicians are concerned about side effects from opioids, such as respiratory depression, ^{1-5, 5-7} nausea and vomiting ^{1, 2, 4, 5, 8-14}, decreased level of consciousness, ileus and urinary retention.^{4, 10, 13} With the development of ketorolac, NSAIDs can now be administered intravenously. Ketorolac provides analgesic effects similar to opioids when used for mild to moderate pain.^{1, 4, 9-12,} ^{14, 16-19} It also has the added benefits of having anti-pyretic and anti-inflammatory properties, and an opioid sparring effect ²⁰. On the negative side, clinicians believe that intravenous NSAIDs increase risk of post-operative bleeding and many are hesitant to use it ^{12, 16, 18, 19, 21-24}. Studies of children undergoing tonsillectomy found that ketorolac increased the number of post-operative bleeding events ¹⁸, risk of a child experiencing a major bleeding episode ¹⁸ and bleeding time.¹⁶ The results of these studies and a meta-analysis²⁵ of studies of pediatric tonsillectomy led to recommendations that ketorolac not be used in pediatric patients following tonsillectomy.

In 2003 Marret et al²⁵ conducted a systematic review, with meta-analysis, about use of ketorolac for post-tonsillectomy pain. They suggested that ketorolac not be used at all in any post-operative tonsillectomy patients because of the risk of bleeding. Concerns³¹ have been raised over the quality of the review including

the method of data pooling used in the meta-analysis. The literature search was not comprehensive and became more limited in scope when non-English publications were eliminated. Even more studies were removed when the quality ranking system eliminated those thought to be of low quality. The seven included studies varied significantly in important aspects of the methods. The studies varied in patient sampled (adult and pediatric), route of drug administration (oral and parental), number or length of doses (one dose to two weeks of doses) and onset of NSAID treatment.

In summary, safety and efficacy of intravenous ketorolac when used in pediatrics has not been established and we lack a systematic review that can guide practice. Our objective was to conduct a systematic review and metaanalysis to examine the risks and benefits of intravenous ketorolac for pediatric patients undergoing any surgical procedure.

METHODS

Study selection

Using the key words and Medical Subject Headings *opioids, narcotics, morphine/ or morphine derivatives, dilaudid, hydromorphone, meperidine, pethidine, demerol, fentanyl, ketorolac tromethamine, ketorolac, toradol,* and the associated drug reference numbers, we conducted a comprehensive literature search of 31 databases including: MEDLINE: (1966-January, 2006), PubMed: (1966 - January, 2006), EMBASE: (1988- January, 2006), and CINAHL: (1982-January, 2006). Selection criteria included: randomized controlled trials of pediatric patients less than18 years of age, who required intravenous pain

medication immediately post-operatively; and a comparison of ketorolac with either an intravenous opioid or placebo. No language restrictions were imposed.

The initial search identified 1637 publications. A review of abstracts led to exclusion of 1564 of these publications for at least one of the following reasons: adult subjects (n=647), non-randomized controlled trial (n=503), non-human subjects (n=34), ketorolac used as an adjunctive medication (n=380). Eighty-eight full text articles were obtained and reviewed by two independent reviewers. An additional 73 studies were excluded from the review for the following reasons: non-randomized controlled trials (n=33), adult patients (n=16) and non-intravenous route of drug administration (n=23). One other study was excluded because the pediatric data could not be separated from the adult data ²⁰. Reference lists of the full text articles were contacted and asked if they were aware of any published or unpublished articles on the topic of the systematic review. Figure 1-1 illustrates the selection and exclusion of studies for this systematic review.

Characteristics of Included Studies

The 15 studies ^{1-3, 8-12, 14, 18, 19, 26-29} included in this systematic review produced a sample of 1022 post-operative pediatric patients for analyses. None of the studies included patients less than 1 year of age. Where reported, the ASA status of patients was I or II.

Of the 15 included studies, seven compared intravenous ketorolac with intravenous opioids ^{2, 8, 10, 14, 18, 26, 28}, five with placebo ^{11, 12, 19, 27, 29} and three with

intravenous opioids and placebo^{1, 3, 9}. In trials that employed a placebo, all subjects received analgesics, but not the study drugs. The placebos consisted of normal saline (in volumes that were identical to the study drugs).

Table 1-1 details the data collected in each of the studies. Data were collected in various studies on occurrence of post-operative bleeding, milliliters of blood loss, bleeding times, post-operative nausea and vomiting, time to discharge from recovery room or hospital, maladaptive behavior, need for administration of rescue doses or adjunctive medications and pain.

Methodological quality

All of the studies included in the review were described as randomized controlled trials. Thirteen of the studies had an allocation concealment that was unclear, making it difficult to ensure that the randomization was completely blinded ^{2,3,8-12,14,18,19,26-28}. Only two of the included studies had an allocation concealment method that was deemed adequate.^{18,33}

Nine studies were considered to be of high quality when evaluated using a Jadad score ≥ 3 . ^{1-3, 8,11,12,18,27,33} Only one study received a Jadad score of 4 ¹⁸. Of the six low quality studies, four studies received a score of 2, ^{10,19,26,28} and two studies received a score of 1. ^{9, 14}

Data Extraction

Data were extracted by two reviewers (W.L.B. and J.L.). The reviewers worked independently to extract the data and then compared their results to identify any discrepancies. Discrepancies were resolved through discussion. Information extracted included study design, setting (inpatient vs. day surgery),

drug comparisons, number and age of patients enrolled, number of patients completing trial, withdrawals or dropouts, blinding, co-interventions and type of surgery. The primary outcomes included post-operative bleeding (incidents of bleeding, milliliters of blood in drains, bleeding time and need for readmission because of bleeding); and any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting. Secondary outcomes included pain (any reported need for "rescue medications" or PRN medications, first reported pain scores, or observed pain), and time (in minutes) to discharge from recovery room and hospital.

While assessing the studies, reviewers extracted data to be used in the meta-analyses. Means and standard deviations were extracted when the data were continuous. If these measures were not reported, they were computed from graphs and figures, or calculated from ranges provided in the article. When dichotomous data were provided, the numbers of events were extracted. Eight studies included in this review were either missing some relevant data or published data in a form that could not be used. Although additional information was sought from all authors, no further data were obtained.

The reviewers also assessed quality of all included studies at the time of data extraction. All studies were examined for allocation concealment and given a Jadad score³², which can be found on Table 1-1.

Statistical Analysis

All data were analyzed using a statistical package (RevMan 4.2.8)³⁰ provided by the Cochrane Collaboration. Dichotomous data were analyzed and reported as relative risk ratios (RR) with a 95% confidence interval and a fixed

effects model. Where significant heterogeneity ($I^2 < 50\%$) occurred, a random effects model was used. Where small event rates occurred, Peto odds ratio was used with a fixed effects model. Continuous data were analyzed and reported as weighted means differences (WMD) where the units examined were combinable.

Where appropriate, subgroup analyses were completed. This included particular surgical procedures, day surgery versus inpatient surgery, high dose (>0.5/mg/kg/dose) versus low dose ketorolac (<0.5 mg/kg/dose), and study duration (>24 hours versus <24 hours).

RESULTS -

Post-Operative Bleeding

The occurrence of post-operative bleeding, as reported in eight studies,^{2, 8-10, 14, 18, 28, 29} was not significantly different for use of ketorolac compared with opioids, regardless of the way that bleeding was measured. A number of comparisons were made. A separate (or subgroup) analysis was carried out with two studies where the surgery was tonsillectomy, and post-operative bleeding is a particular concern. ^{8, 18} No significant difference was found for ketorolac compared with opioids for reported occurrences of post-operative bleeding.

A single study ¹⁹ measured milliliters of post-operative blood loss in drains and bleeding time. The analysis of blood loss, which was statistically significant, favored the use of ketorolac over opioids (WMD, -3.20; 95% CI, -5.49 to -0.91). No statistical difference was found in mean bleeding time². Analysis of the data from two studies looking at the need for re-operation or readmission to hospital due to bleeding found no difference between ketorolac and opioids ^{1, 18}.

16

.

The analysis also focused on the effect of the dose of ketorolac on bleeding. In comparing ketorolac and opioids, seven studies used high doses of ketorolac (>0.5/mg/kg/dose) ^{1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 18, 28} versus one study that used a low dose of ketorolac (<0.5 mg/kg/dose) ¹⁹. No higher bleeding rates were found among those who received a high dose versus those who received a low dose.

The half life of ketorolac is approximately 2 hours, with it taking five to six drug half lives to deplete the anti-platelet effect ³¹. This led to the question, will patients who have been on the drug for only a short amount of time have less bleeding events in the overall course of their treatment than those who have been administered the drug for a prolonged period of time. No difference was found for ketorolac and opioids for bleeding events and administration duration greater than 24 hours¹⁹ versus less than 24 hours^{1, 2, 8, 9, 14, 18, 28}.

Five studies^{1,9,12,27,29} compared ketorolac and placebo for any bleeding event post operatively. No significant difference was found. There was no statistical difference between placebo and ketorolac when examining intraoperative blood loss¹², patients requiring post-operative blood transfusions²⁹, readmission to hospital^{1,12,29}, day surgery⁹ versus inpatients^{1,12,27,29}, high dose^{1,9,12,29} versus low dose²⁷, and dose duration (>24 hours^{27,29} versus <24 hours^{1,9,12}).

Nausea and Vomiting

The occurrence of nausea and vomiting was recorded in 12 studies^{1-3, 8-10,} ^{12, 14, 18, 27-29}, eight of which compared ketorolac and opioids. The meta-analysis determined a statistically significant decrease in nausea and vomiting when

ketorolac was administered compared with opioids (RR, 0.53; 95% Cl, 0.29 to 0.96). The number needed to treat (NNT) was 6.

It was possible to analyze certain surgical procedures where the occurrence of nausea and vomiting is a concern. An analysis of three studies ^{9, 10, 14} of strabismus repair surgery determined that nausea and vomiting occurred significantly less when ketorolac was used compared with opioids (RR=0.3; 95% CI 0.16 to 0.56, NNT=3). Nausea and vomiting was also occurred significantly less for tonsillectomy patients receiving ketorolac compared to opioids (RR=0.78; 95% CI 0.61 to 0.99; NNT=12). ^{8, 18}

Subgroup analyses of studies conducted with day surgery patients ^{8-10, 14,} ^{18, 28} (RR=0.37; 95% CI 0.18 to 0.77, NNT=4), and of studies using high doses of ketorolac \geq 0.6 mg/kg ^{1, 2, 8-10, 14, 18, 28} (RR=0.53, 95%CI 0.28 to 0.99, NNT=6) also found significantly less nausea and vomiting in the ketorolac group versus opioid comparison. No significant difference in occurrence of nausea and vomiting was found for ketorolac versus opioids in studies conducted in inpatient settings¹⁻³, and in studies where patients received low doses of ketorolac \leq 0.5 mg/kg³.

Time to Discharge

Three studies examined time to discharge from recovery room ^{1, 18, 28} and five examined time to discharge from hospital ^{9, 10, 18, 19, 28} No significant difference in discharge times was found for use of ketorolac versus opioids. Patients receiving ketorolac were discharged earlier from the recovery room compared with the placebo group ^{1, 10} (WMD -10.62; 95% CI -71.97 to -11.79), but not from the hospital ^{9, 29}.

Pain Control

An observational pain scale called the Objective Pain Scale was used by a number of researchers ^{1,8-10,14,28}. When examining the first reported pain score of all studies using the Objective Pain Scale, no significant difference was found in scores between those receiving ketorolac and those receiving opioids.

One measure of pain control is need for rescue medications. Patients receiving ketorolac did not require more "rescue" medications than those receiving opioids.^{2, 3,9,10,14,18,28}. One study ²⁹ examined patients who were receiving fentanyl in the recovery room for pain control. In addition to fentanyl, ketorolac was administered to one group of the study and a placebo to the other. The group receiving the ketorolac required significantly less fentanyl than the placebo counterpart (WMD -27.26; 95% CI -49.65 to -3.93).

COMMENT

This meta-analysis has produced three main findings that will be of interest to practitioners who work with post surgical pediatric patients. The first significant result is that ketorolac provides no greater risk of post-operative bleeding to patients than opioids or placebo comparisons. The second is that there is a significant reduction in nausea and vomiting in patients receiving ketorolac instead of opioids. And third is that pain control is comparable for ketorolac and opioids in mild to moderate pain.

Ketorolac has been thought to be associated with post-operative bleeding and its use avoided in pediatrics. It has been removed from use in the intraoperative formulary in the United Kingdom because of the risk of bleeding. This

review and meta-analysis indicate that fears about bleeding with use of ketorolac are without foundation. While it is true that this meta-analyses indicated significantly greater loss of blood (as measured in a drain), the results cannot be considered to be conclusive. Only a single study with a small sample size (n=35 per group) was available for analysis.

The findings of several studies have caused a controversy about the potential for post-operative use of ketorolac to cause bleeding ^{18,25}. In fact, Gunter et al.¹⁸ elected to stop their trial early due to concerns about bleeding caused by ketorolac. This is an example of a single study, with a low frequency event, having a larger impact on clinical behavior than may be warranted. Seemingly significant findings can be caused by a number of confounds (from design problems, to inadvertent biases, to statistical methods). One possibility here is surgical skill level as some of the procedures in the Gunter et al study were carried out by surgical residents. The approach for categorizing "major bleeding" may also have created problems. The major bleeding category only involved one patient requiring re-operation in the first 24 hours. The other 4 patients required further evaluation by medical staff, with one patient being discharged from the emergency room and three admitted to hospital. It would be interesting to learn if the patients who required readmission to the hospital for major bleeding had a significant drop in post-operative hemoglobin to correlate with the diagnosis. The re-operation for the subject in the ketorolac group came on post-operative day 5 which would be difficult to attribute to the drug itself as the anti-platelet effect does not last longer than 24 hours.

Ketorolac causes less nausea and vomiting than opioids. Ketorolac should be considered for use particularly for surgical procedures where post-operative vomiting is a concern. It should also be used in day surgery so that parents can travel home without fear that the child will vomit during the trip.

Patients receiving ketorolac were found to have less pain, require less rescue medications, and a quicker discharge from recovery room, with no increase in negative side effects, than those receiving placebo. The opioid sparing effect of ketorolac should encourage practitioners to consider prescribing it as an adjuvant to intravenous opioids, where they would not have previously done so. Much debate has happened as to whether or not ketorolac causes a delay in bone healing in orthopedic patients. The current research examining this concern used animal models or adult patients. In the future, randomized control trials of pediatric patients need to be completed in order to resolve the issue.

This is a good example of clinical decisions being made on the basis of individual studies. Sometimes research with small sample sizes and infrequent events will produce results that do not stand up. A meta-analysis may help practitioners to make informed decisions for their patients in an efficient and effective manner while avoiding small event size bias.

References

1. Watcha MF, Jones MB, Lagueruela RG, Schweiger C, White PF. Comparison of ketorolac and morphine as adjuvants during pediatric surgery. *Anesthesiology*. 1992;76:368-372.

2. Lieh-Lai MW, Kauffman RE, Uy HG, Danjin M, Simpson PM. A randomized comparison of ketorolac tromethamine and morphine for postoperative analgesia in critically ill children. *Critical care medicine*. 1999;27:2786-2791.

3. Maunuksela EL, Kokki H, Bullingham RE. Comparison of intravenous ketorolac with morphine for postoperative pain in children. *Clinical Pharmacology* & *Therapeutics*. 1992;52:436-443.

4. Carney DE, Nicolette LA, Ratner MH, Minerd A, Baesl TJ. Ketorolac reduces postoperative narcotic requirements. *Journal of Pediatric Surgery*. 2001;36:76-79.

5. Anthony D, Jasinski DM. Postoperative pain management: Morphine versus ketorolac. *Journal of PeriAnesthesia Nursing*. 2002;17:30-42.

6. Mather L, Mckie J. The incidence of postoperative pain in children. *Pain*. 1983;15:271-82.

7. Schechter NL, Allen DA, Hanson K. Status of pediatric pain control: A comparision of hospital analgesic usage in children an din adults. *Pediatrics*. 1986;77:11-5.

8. Keidan I, Zaslansky R, Eviatar E, Segal S, Sarfaty SM. Intraoperative ketorolac is an effective substitute for fentanyl in children undergoing outpatient adenotonsillectomy. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 2004;14:318-323.

9. Mendel HG, Guarnieri KM, Sundt LM, Torjman MC. The effects of ketorolac and fentanyl on postoperative vomiting and analgesic requirements in children undergoing strabismus surgery. *Anesthesia and analgesia*. 1995;80:1129-1133.

10. Munro HM, Riegger LQ, Reynolds PI, Wilton NC, Lewis IH. Comparison of the analgesic and emetic properties of ketorolac and morphine for paediatric outpatient strabismus surgery. *British journal of anaesthesia*. 1994;72:624-628.

11. Munro HM, Walton SR, Malviya S, et al. Low-dose ketorolac improves analgesia and reduces morphine requirements following posterior spinal fusion in adolescents. *Can J Anesth*. 2002;49:461-466.

12. Romsing J. Analgesic efficacy and safety of preoperative versus postoperative ketorolac in paediatric tonsillectomy. *Acta anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 1998;42:770-775.

13. Romsing J, Walther-Larsen S. Peri-operative use of nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs in children: Analgesic efficacy and bleeding.[see comment].[review] [40 refs]. *Anaesthesia*. 1997 Jul;52:673-683.

14. Shende D. Comparative effects of intravenous ketorolac and pethidine on perioperative analgesia and postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) for paediatric strabismus surgery. *Acta anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*. 1999;43:265-269.

15. Anysley-Green A. Pain and stress in infancy and childhood-where to now? *Paediatric Anaesthesia*. 1996;6:167-172.

16. Bean-Lijewski JD, Hunt RD. Effect of ketorolac on bleeding time and postoperative pain in children: A double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison with meperidine. *Journal of clinical anesthesia*. 1996;8:25-30.

17. Chauhan RD, Charles BI, Noe HN. Safety of ketorolac in the pediatric population after ureteroneocystomy. *The Journal of Urology*. 2001;166:1873-1875.

18. Gunter JB, Varughese AM, Harrington JF, et al. Recovery and complications after tonsillectomy in children: A comparison of ketorolac and morphine. *Anesthesia and analgesia.* 1995;81:1136-1141.

19. Gupta A, Daggett C, Ludwick J, Wells W, Lewis A. Ketorolac after congenital heart surgery: Does it increase the risk of significant bleeding complications? *Paediatric Anaesthesia Paris.* 2005;15:139-142.

20. Pendeville PE, Van Boven MJ, Contreras V, et al. Ketorolac tromethamine for postoperative analgesia in oral surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Belgica*. 1995;46:25-30.
21. Judkins JH, Dray TG, Hubbell RN. Intraoperative ketorolac and posttonsillectomy bleeding. *Arch Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*. 1996 Sep;122:937-940.

22. Marret E. In reply to nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsillectomy: Do we have the data? *Anesthesiology*. 2004;100:751-752.

23. Rusy LM, Houck CS, Sullivan LJ, et al. A double-blind evaluation of ketorolac tromethamine versus acetaminophen in pediatric tonsillectomy: Analgesia and bleeding. *Anesth Analg.* 1995 Feb;80:226-229.

24. Splinter WM, Rhine EJ, Roberts DW, Reid CW, MacNeill HB. Preoperative ketorolac increases bleeding after tonsillectomy in children. *Canadian journal of anaesthesia = Journal canadien d'anesthesie*. 1996;43:560-563.

25. Marret E, Antoine F, Samama CM, Bonnet F. Effects of postoperative, nonsteroidal, antiinflammatory drugs on bleeding risk after tonsillectomy: Meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials. *Anesthesiology*. 2003;98:1497-1502.

26. Chiaretti A, Simeone E, Langer A, et al. Comparison of ketorolac and fentanyl for pain relief in pediatric intensive care. *Pediatria Medica e Chirurgica*. 1997;19:419-424.

27. Park JM, Houck CS, Sethna NF, et al. Ketorolac suppresses postoperative bladder spasms after pediatric ureteral reimplantation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*. 2000;91:11-15.

28. Purday JP, Reichert CC, Merrick PM. Comparative effects of three doses of intravenous ketorolac or morphine on emesis and analgesia for restorative dental surgery in children. *Canadian journal of anaesthesia = Journal canadien d'anesthesie*. 1996;43:221-225.

29. Sutters KA, Shaw BA, Gerardi JA, Hebert D. Comparison of morphine patient-controlled analgesia with and without ketorolac for postoperative analgesia in pediatric orthopedic surgery. *The American journal of orthopedics*. 1999;28:351-358.

30. The nordic cochrane center. RevMan. Denmark:2005;4.2.8. Available from: www.cc-ims.net/RevMan/download.htm.

31. Dsida R, Coté, CJ. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsillectomy: do we have the data? *Anesthesiology*. 2004, 100:749-750.

32. Jadad, AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C., Reynolds DJ. & Gavaghan, DJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: Is blinding necessary? *Controlled Clinical Trials*. *1996; 17*,1-12

33. Sutters KA, Levine JD, Dibble S, Savedra M, Miaskowski C. Analgisic
efficacy and safety of single-dose intramuscular ketorolac for post-operative pain
management in children following tonsillectomy. *Pain* 1995; 61:145-53.
34. Glassman SD et al. The effect of postoperative nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drug administration on spinal fusion. *Spine* 1998 23: 834-838.

35. Brady-Fryer B, Wiebe N, & LanderJA. Pain relief for neonatal circumcision. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2004. *Art. No: CD004217*(3)

Figure 1-1. Summary of Article Selection Process



Table 1-1. Characteristics of Randomized Controlled Trials Comparing Intravenous Ketorolac with Intravenous Opioid or Placebo

Source	Participants	Interventions	Pain	Bleeding	N&V	"Rescue" Meds	Time to Discharge	Maladaptive Behaviors	 Jadad Score/ Allocation Concealment
Chiaretti, 1997 ²⁶	 52 patients 1-10 yr Inpatients 	 Ketorolac 1.2 mg/kg q6h Ketorolac 1.2 mg/kg (bolus) + 0.21 mg/kg/hr Fentanyl 1 mcg/kg/hr Fentanyl 1 mcg/kg/hr + Ketorolac 0.21 mg/kg/hr 	✓	×	×	×	×	x · ·	2/B
Gunter et al, 1995 ¹⁸	 97 patients 1-12 yr Tonsillectomy Day surgery 	 Ketorolac 1mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg 	×	√	1	~	~	×	4/A
Gupta et al, 2005 ¹⁹	 72 patients 2 days to 18 yr Surgery for congenital heart disease 	 Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg Q6h ATC No ketorolac 	×	×	×	×	*	*	2/B
Keidan et al, 2004 ⁸	 57 patients 1.7 to 10 yr Surgery: adenoidectomy and laser-assisted tonsillectomy 	 Ketorolac 1 mg/kg Fentanyl 2 μg/kg 	×	✓	*	×	×	4	3/B
Lieh-Lai et al, 1999 ²	 102 patients 7-12 yr Admitted to the intensive care unit post-operatively 	 Ketorolac 0.6 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg 	~	✓	*	✓	×	×	3/В
Maunuksela et al, 1992 ³	 92 patients, 3 to 12 yr Elective surgery 	 Morphine 0.1mg/kg Ketorolac 0.2 mg/kg + 0.2 mg/kg, + 0.1 mg/kg Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg followed by 2 doses of placebo 	×	x	×	*	x	×	3/В
Mendel et al, 1995 ⁹	 54 patients; 1 to 10 yr Strabismus surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.9 mg/kg Fentanyl 1 microgram/kg, Saline placebo 	1	✓	✓	4	*	×	1/B

Munro et al, 1994 ¹⁰	 42 patients, 2-12 yr Strabismus surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.75 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg and metoclopramide 0.15 mg/kg IV 	×	4	✓	√	~	×	2/B
Munro et al, 2002 ¹¹	 35 patients, 11-17 yr, Posterior spinal fusion surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg Normal Saline 5 ml 	×	×	×	×	x	×	3/В
Park et al., 2000 ²⁷	 24 patients, 4 to 11.5 yr, Ureteral re- implantation surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg Normal Saline 	×	×	✓	*	x	×	3/В
Purday et al., 1996 ²⁸	 120 patients 2-10 yr Dental restorative surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.75 mg/kg Ketorolac 1.0 mg/kg Ketorolac 1.5 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg IV 	✓	~	×	√	✓	×	2/B
Romsing et al, 1998 ¹²	 60 patients, 5 to 15 yr Tonsillectomy 	 Ketorolac 1 mg/kg Placebo 	~	×	✓	×	×	x	3/B
Shende et al, 1999 ¹⁴	 52 patients 2.5 to 15 yr Strabismus surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.9 mg/kg Pethidine 0.5 mg/kg 	✓	✓	×	√	×	×	1/B
Sutters et al, 1999 ²⁹	 68 patients, Avg 12.6 years of age, Orthopedic surgery 	 Ketorolac 1 mg/kg loading dose with 0.5 mg/kg q6h Placebo 	×	✓	✓	1	x	×	3/A
Watcha et al, 1992 ¹	95 patients5-15 yr	 Ketorolac 0.9 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg Normal saline 	✓	×	1	×	<u>√</u>	×	3/B

Table 1-1. Characteristics of Randomized Controlled Trials Comparing Intravenous Ketorolac with Intravenous Opioid or Placebo Cont.

\$

Figure 1-2. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Any Post-Operative Bleeding Event

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

 Outcome:
 01 Any bleeding event

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 All surgeries					
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31			Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18	Т		Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30			Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48			Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26			Not estimable
Keidan et al. 2004	0/25	0/32			Not estimable
Gupta et al. 2005	1/35	1/35		12.77	1.00 [0.06. 16.32]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	329	267	-	100 00	0.96 [0.35 2 60]
fotal events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 (Opioid	ds)				
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.00$.	df = 1 (P = 0.97), i ² = 0%	•			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.08 (P =	0.93)				
02 Tonsillecotmy with/without adence	pidectomy				
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32	Т		Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	74	79		100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (Opioid	ds)		T		
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable	e				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.09 (P =	0.93)				
03 Strabismus repair					
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/25			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	44	44			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Opioid	ds)				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable	e				
Test for overall effect: not applicable	e				
04 Cardiac surgery					
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35		100.00	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	35	35		100.00	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 (Opioid	(sk				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable	e				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P =	1.00)				
			0.1 1 10	100	
		F	avours Ketorolac Favours Or	pioids	

Figure 1-3. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Milliliters of Blood Loss in Drains

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intrave 10 Bleeding Events 02 Drain blood loss	nous Kel :- Ketorol : (mls)	torolac in the Pain Control lac vs Opioids	of Post-Operat	ive Pediatric Patients: /	A Systematio	Review				
Study or sub-category		N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)		W	MD (fixed) 95% Cl		Weight %	VVMD (fixed) 95% Cl
Gupta et al, 200)5	35	13.30(4.50)	35	16.50(5.25)			-		100.00	-3.20 [-5.49, -0.91]
Total (95% Cl) Test for heteroge Test for overall e	eneity: not applicable effect: Z = 2.74 (P =	35 e 0.006)		35			-			100.00	-3.20 [-5.49, -0.91]
					contente e	-10 Favo	-5 urs Ketorol	0 ac Favo	5 Urs Opinio	10	

Figure 1-4. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Bleeding Time

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids 03 Bleeding time										
Study or sub-category	4	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)		W	MD (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl	
Lieh-Lai, 1999		54	6.00(4.00)	48	6.00(6.00)				100.00	0.00 [-2.00, 2.00]	
Total (95% Cl) Test for heterog Test for overall	geneity: not applica effect: Z = 0.00 (F	54 able ? = 1.00)		48				+	100.00	0.00 [-2.00, 2.00]	
						-10	-5	0 5	10		

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure 1-5. Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Requiring Readmission to Hospital or Re-operation Due to Bleeding

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous K 10 Bleeding Events- Ketor 04 Readmission/Reoperation	etorolac in th blac vs Opioi on	e Pain Control of Post-Ope ds	rative Pediatric Patients: A	Systematic	Review	
Study or sub-category	Ket	orolac n/N	Opioids n/N	Peto 95%	OR Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
Watcha, 1992	0	/32	0/31				Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	3	/49	1/47			100.00	2.69 [0.37, 19.73]
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 3 (l Test for heterog Test for overall e	Ketorolac),1 (Opioids) eneity: not applicable effect: Z = 0.97 (P ≈ 0.33)	81	78	-		100.00	2.69 [0.37, 19.73]
				0.001 0.01 0.1 1	10	100 1000	
				Favours Ketorolac	Favours O	pioids	

<u></u>34

Figure 1-6. Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Inpatients vs. Outpatients

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 05 Inpatients vs Day surgery patients

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac ກ/N	Opioids n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 Inpatients					
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31			Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48			Not estimable
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35		12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	121	114		12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
otal events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 i	(Opioids)				
est for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
fest for overall effect: Z = 0.0	0 (P = 1.00)				
)2 Daysurgery Patients					
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18	Т		Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30			Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26			Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	208	153		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
otal events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 ((Opioids)				
est for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
est for overall effect: Z = 0.0	9 (P = 0.93)				
otal (95% Cl)	329	267		100.00	0.96 [0.35, 2.60]
otal events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 ((Opioids)		Ť		- , .
est for heterogeneity: Chi ² = I	0.00, df = 1 (P = 0.97), l² = 0%				
fest for overall effect: Z = 0.0	8 (P = 0.93)				
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.01	0.1 1 10	100	
		F	avours Ketorolac — Favours O	oioids	

ω 35

Figure 1-7. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - High Dose Ketorolac vs. Low Dose Ketorolac

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 06 High dose Ketorolac vs Low dose Ketorolac

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n∕N	Opioids n/N	Peto 95%	OR Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.6 mg/kg/d	ose)					
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31				Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		 	87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18		-		Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30				Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48				Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26				Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32				Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	294	232			87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (Opioids)	I		T			·
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.09$ (P = 0.	93)					
02 Low dose Ketorolac (<=0.5 mg/kg/c	lose)					
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35			12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	35	35			12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 (Opioids)	l			—		-
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable						
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.00$ (P = 1.	00)					
Total (95% Cl)	329	267			100.00	0.96 [0.35, 2.60]
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 (Opioids)				-		
Test for heterogeneity; Chi ² = 0.00, df	= 1 (P = 0.97), I ² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.08$ (P = 0.	93)					
		().01 0.1 1	10	100	
			Favours Ketorolac	Favours Onioi	de.	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 1-8. Bleeding -- Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Dose Duration >24 Hours vs. Dose Duration <24 Hours

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 07 > 24 hours doing vs <24 hour dosing

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N		Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 ≻24 hour dosing						
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35	-		- 12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	35	35			- 12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 ((Opioids)					
Test for heterogeneity: not app	olicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.0	0 (P = 1.00)					
02 <24 hour dosing						
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31				Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47			87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18		Т		Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30				Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48				Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26				Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32				Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	294	232			87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 ((Opioids)					
Test for heterogeneity: not app	olicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.09	9 (P = 0.93)					
Total (95% Cl)	329	267		-	100.00	0.96 [0.35, 2.60]
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 ((Opioids)			T		
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 = (0.00, df = 1 (P = 0.97), P = 0%	,				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00	8 (P = 0.93)					
			0.01 (D.1 1 10	100	
			Favours	Ketorolac Favours C	pioids	

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure 1-9. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Any Post-Operative Bleeding Event

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 01 Any bleeding event

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 All surgeries					
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32		7,72	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15		46.14	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32			Not estimable
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12	_		Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	128	109		53.86	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5 (Placebo) Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.26$, df = Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.39$ (P = 0.1	1 (P = 0.61), l² = 0 7)	%			
02 Tonsillectomy with without adenoide	ctomy				
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15		46.14	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 4 (Placebo) Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.09 (P = 0.2	30	15	-	46.14	0.41 (0.08, 2.04)
03 Strabismus surgery					
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo) Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: not applicable	18	18			Not estimable
04 Ureteral reimplant					
Park et al. 2000	0/12	0/12			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl) Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo) Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: not applicable	12	12			Not estimable
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 9 (Placebo) Test for heterogeneity: Chi² = 0.28, df = Test for overall effect: Z = 1.76 (P = 0.0	188 2 (P = 0.87), I ² = 0 08)	154 %	•	100.00	0.38 {0.13, 1.12}
······································		0.00	1 0.01 0.1 1 10 1	00 1000	
		F	avours Ketorolac — Favours Pla	icebo	

Figure 1-10. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Pre/Intra-operative Blood Loss

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo 02 Intraoperative blood loss										
Study or sub-category		N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)		v	MAD (fixed) 95% Cl		Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl
Romsing, 1998		40	3.15(2.50)	20	3.10(2.00)			-		100.00	0.05 [-1.12, 1.22]
Total (95% Cl) Test for heterog Test for overall a	eneity: not applicabl effect: Z = 0.08 (P =	40 e 0.93)		20				+		100.00	0.05 [-1.12, 1.22]
						-10 Eavo	-5 ure Ketoro	0 Dec Favo	5 Inter Diace	10	

Figure 1-11. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Patients Requiring Post-Operative Blood Transfusions

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenou 11 Bleeding Events - K 03 Postoperative trans	is Ketorolac in the etorolac vs Place fusions	Pain Control of Post-Operativ bo	e Pediatric Patients: A Systematic	Review	
Study or sub-category		Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	∨veight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
Sutters et al, 19	99	0/36	0/32			Not estimable
Munro et al, 200	12	4/20	3/15	— # —	100.00	1.00 [0.19, 5.20]
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 4 (Test for heterog Test for overall (Ketorolac), 3 (Placebo) eneity: not applicable affect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.0	56 D)	47	•	100.00	1.00 [0.19, 5.20]
<u></u>			0.0	001 0.01 0.1 1 10	100 1000	

Figure 1-12. Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Requiring Readmission to Hospital or Re-operation

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo 04 Readmission/Reoperation							
Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl			
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32			0.14 [0.00, 6.82]			
Romsing, 1998	1/30	0/15		47.06	4.48 [0.07, 286.49]			
Sutters et al, 19	99 0/36	0/32			Not estimable			
Total (95% Cl)	98	79		100.00	0.70 [0.04, 12.17]			
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 (Placebo)							
Test for heterog	eneity: Chi² = 1.44, df = 1 (P = 0.23), l² = 3	0.6%						
Test for overall	effect: Z = 0.24 (P = 0.81)							

Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo

Figure 1-13. Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Inpatients vs. Day Surgery

Review:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review
- ·	

Comparison: 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 05 Day surgery patients vs Inpatients

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 Inpatients					
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32		14.33	0.14 (0.00, 6.82)
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15		85.67	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32			Not estimable
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	110	91		100.00	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5 (Placebo)				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0	0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61), l² ≈ 09	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39	9 (P = 0.17)				
02 Day Surgery Patients					
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Ci)	18	18			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo)				
Test for heterogeneity: not app	blicable				
Test for overall effect: not app	licable				
		0.0	1 0.1 1 10	100	
			Farmer Materials - Farmer Bi		

Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo

Figure 1-14. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - High Dose (≥0.6 mg/kg/dose) Ketorolac vs. Low Dose (≤0.5 mg/kg/dose) Ketorolac

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 06 High dose Ketorolac vs Low dose Ketorolac

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac ກ/N	Placebo n/N		Peto (95%	OR Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.	5 ma/ka/dose)						
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32	←			14.33	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18					Not estimable
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15				85.67	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	116	97			F	100.00	0.35 (0.08, 1.54)
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5	(Placebo)						
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61), l ² = 09	6					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.3$	89 (P = 0.17)						
02 Low dose Ketorolac (<=0.)	5 mg/kg/dose)						
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	12	12					Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0	(Placebo)						
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect: not ap	olicable						
	······································		0.01	0.1 1	10	100	
			-	12 1 1		•	

Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo

Figure 1-15. Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Dose Duration >24 Hours vs. Dose Duration <24 Hours

Review:	The Role of Intravenous	Ketorolac in the Pain C	Control of Post-Operative	Pediatric Patients: A	Systematic Review
---------	-------------------------	-------------------------	---------------------------	-----------------------	-------------------

Comparison: 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 07 >24 hour dosing duration vs <24 hour dosing duration

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N		Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 >24 hour dosing duration						
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32				Not estimable
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12				Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	48	44				Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo)					
Test for heterogeneity: not app	blicable					
Test for overall effect: not app	licable					
02 <24 hour dosing duration						
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32	←		14.33	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18				Not estimable
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15	_		85.67	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	80	65	-		100.00	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5 (Placebo)					
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = (0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61), l ² = 0%	6				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.3	9 (P = 0.17)					
			0.01 0.	1 1 10	100	
			Favours K	etorolac Favours P	iacebo	

.

Figure 1-16. Bleeding – Gunter et al Study

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

		_	
Outcome:	08 Gunter	et ai	Study

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n∕N	Opioids n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 Bleeding events <24 hours	······································				
Gunter, 1995	13/49	2/47		100.00	5.32 [1.78, 15.93]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	5.32 [1.78, 15.93]
fotal events: 13 (Ketorolac), 2 (Opioids)				
fest for heterogeneity: not appli	cable				
fest for overall effect: Z = 2.99	(P = 0.003)				
)2 Bleeding events >24 hours					
Gunter, 1995	7/49	12/47		100.00	0.50 [0.18, 1.35]
Jubtotal (95% Cl)	49	47		100.00	0.50 [0.18, 1.35]
iotal events: 7 (Ketorolac), 12 (4	Opioids)		_		
est for heterogeneity: not appli	cable				
fest for overall effect: Z =1.38	(P = 0.17)				
3 Post-operative bleeding requi	ring re-operation				
Gunter, 1995	2/49	1/47		- 100.00	1.89 [0.19, 18.66]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		- 100.00	1.89 [0.19, 18.66]
fotal events: 2 (Ketorolac), 1 (O	pioids)				
est for heterogeneity: not appli	cable				
est for overall effect: Z = 0.55	(P = 0.58)				
9 Any Bleeding					
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
ubtotal (95% Cl)	49	47		100.00	0.95 (0.33, 2.77)
otal events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (O	pioids)				
est for heterogeneity: not appli	cable				
est for overall effect: Z = 0.09	(P = 0.93)				
0 Major bleeding					
Gunter, 1995	6/49	5/47		100.00	1.17 [0.34, 4.08]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	1.17 [0.34, 4.08]
fotal events: 6 (Ketorolac), 5 (O	pioids)		_		
est for heterogeneity: not appli	cable				
est for overall effect: Z = 0.25 ((P = 0.81)				

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure 1-17. Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Opioids

Review:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review
Comparison:	08 N&V- Ketorolac vs Opioids
Outcome:	01 Had any N&V post-operativly

mparison:	08 N&V-	Ketorolac	vs Opioids

come:	01 Had a⊓y N&V	′ post-operativly
-------	----------------	-------------------

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 All surgeries	** * *	1.10 18.00 00 C			
Maunuksela, 1992	2/61	2/31		4.96	0.51 [0.08, 3.44]
Watcha, 1992	8/32	18/31		15.66	0.43 [0.22, 0.84]
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21	_ _	6.93	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47	-	21.24	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18	_	4.72	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Purday et al, 1996	12/90	16/30	=-	16.32	0.25 [0.13, 0.47]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	22/54	4/48		11.52	4.89 [1.81, 13.18]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26		14.69	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32		3,96	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	376	284	•	100.00	0.53 (0.29, 0.96)
Total events: 86 (Ketorolac), 1	14 (Opioids)				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	35.79, df = 8 (P < 0.0001), ²	= 77.6%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.0	9 (P = 0.04)				
02 Tonsillectomy with/without	adenoidectomy				
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47		84.30	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32		15.70	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	74	79	•	100.00	0.78 [0.61, 0.99]
fotal events: 33 (Ketorolac), 4	l2 (Opioids)		•		·
fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.32, df = 1 (P = 0.57), P = 09	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.0	11 (P = 0.04)				
03 Strabismus repair					
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21	— — ——————————————————————————————————	26.30	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18	_	17.92	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26		55.78	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Subtotal (95% CI)	65	65	→	100.00	0.30 [0.16, 0.56]
otal events: 9 (Ketorolac), 32	2 (Opioids)		-		,,
Fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.95, df = 2 (P = 0.62), l ² = 09	6	1		
Fest for overall effect: Z = 3.7	'5 (P = 0.0002)				
	-		·····		

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure 1-18. Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Day Surgery vs. Inpatients

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Outcome: 02 Day surgery patients vs Inpatients

or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 Day Surgery Patients	·····			<u> </u>	
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21		12.52	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47		26.39	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18		9.18	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Purdayet al, 1996	12/90	16/30	-#-	22.71	0.25 [0.13, 0.47]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26		21.30	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
	1 (05	2/22	_	7.90	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	0/02			
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.63	229 2(Opioids) 3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), l ² 3 (P = 0.008)	174 = 78.4%	•	100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.63 12 Innetients	229 229 0 (Opioids) 3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), l ² 3 (P = 0.008)	174 = 78.4%	•	100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Test for heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.63 D2 Inpatients Maunuksela, 1992	229 0 (Opioids) 3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), l ² 3 (P = 0.008) 2 (61	174 = 78.4%	•	100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Test for heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 Test for overall effect: Z = 2.63 D2 Inpatients Maunuksela, 1992 Watcha. 1992	229 (Opioids) (3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), I ² (P = 0.008) 2/61 8/32	2/31 18/31	◆ 	100.00 19.18 44 40	0.37 [0.18, 0.77] 0.51 [0.08, 3.44] 0.43 [0.22 0.84]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.63 12 Inpatients Maunuksela, 1992 Vetcha, 1992 Lieh-Lai, 1999	229 (Opioids) (3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), ² 3 (P = 0.008) 2/61 8/32 22/54	2/31 18/31 4/48	◆ ●	100.00 19.18 44.40 36.42	0.37 [0.18, 0.77] 0.51 [0.08, 3.44] 0.43 [0.22, 0.84] 4.89 [1.81, 13, 18]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Fest for heterogeneity: Chi² = 2 Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.63 D2 Inpatients Maunuksela, 1992 Watcha, 1992 Lieh-Lai, 1999 Subtotal (95% CI)	229 (Opioids) (3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), ² 3 (P = 0.008) 2/61 8/32 22/54 147	2/31 174 2/31 18/31 4/48 110		100.00 19.18 44.40 36.42 100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77] 0.51 [0.08, 3.44] 0.43 [0.22, 0.84] 4.89 [1.81, 13.18] 1.06 [0.17, 6.64]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.63)2 Inpatients Maunuksela, 1992 Watcha, 1992 Lieh-Lai, 1999 Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 32 (Ketorolac), 24	229 0 (Opioids) 3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), ² 3 (P = 0.008) 2/61 8/32 22/54 147 4 (Opioids)	2/31 18/31 4/48 110		100.00 19.18 44.40 36.42 100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77] 0.51 [0.08, 3.44] 0.43 [0.22, 0.84] 4.89 [1.81, 13.18] 1.06 [0.17, 6.64]
Keidan et al, 2004 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events: 54 (Ketorolac), 90 Fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 2 Fest for overall effect: Z = 2.63 02 Inpatients Maunuksela, 1992 Watcha, 1992 Lieh-Lai, 1999 Subtotal (95% CI) Fotal events: 32 (Ketorolac), 24 Fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 1	229 229 0 (Opioids) 3.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), ² 3 (P = 0.008) 2/61 8/32 22/54 147 4 (Opioids) 7.38, df = 2 (P = 0.0002), ²	2/31 18/31 4/48 110 = 88.5%		100.00 19.18 44.40 36.42 100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77] 0.51 [0.08, 3.44] 0.43 [0.22, 0.84] 4.89 [1.81, 13.18] 1.06 [0.17, 6.64]

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Comparison: 08 N&V- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Figure 1-19. Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - High dose vs. Low dose ketorolac

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Outcome: 03 High dose Keotorlac vs Low dose Ketorolac

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids תאו	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
 01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.6	mg/kg/dose)				
Watcha, 1992	8/32	18/31	-#-	15.79	0.43 [0.22, 0.84]
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21		8.92	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47		18.81	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18		6.54	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Purday et al, 1996	12/90	16/30		16.19	0.25 [0.13, 0.47]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	22/54	4/48		12.95	4.89 [1.81, 13.18]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26	-#	15.18	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32		5.63	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% CI)	315	253	•	100.00	0.53 [0.28, 0.99]
Total events: 84 (Ketorolac), 1	12 (Opioids)		-		· · · ·
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	35.72, df = 7 (P < 0.00001), P	= 80.4%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.9	8 (P = 0.05)				
02 Low dose ketorolac (<=0.5	mg/kg/dose)				
Maunuksela, 1992	2/61	2/31		100.00	0.51 [0.08, 3.44]
Subtotal (95% CI)	61	31		100.00	0.51 [0.08, 3.44]
Fotal events: 2 (Ketorolac), 2 ((Opioids)				·
Test for heterogeneity: not app	blicable				
Test for overall effect: $7 = 0.6$	9 (P = 0.49)				

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Comparison: 08 N&V- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Figure 1-20. Time (in minutes) to Discharge from Recovery Room (PARR) – Ketorolac vs. Placebo.

Review:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review
---------	---

Comparison: 07 Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 01 Discharge from Recovery Room (PARR) (mins)

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl
01 All Surgeries							·····
Watcha,1992	32	35.80(10.70)	32	46.00(14.20)		97.87	-10.20 [-16.36, -4.04]
Munro et al, 2002	20	301.00(63.00)	15	331.00(62.00)		2.13	-30.00 [-71.79, 11.79]
Subtotal (95% CI)	52		47		•	100.00	-10.62 [-16.72, -4.53]
Test for heterogeneity: Chil	² = 0.84, df = 1 (F	² = 0.36), i ² = 0%			•		· · ·
Test for overall effect: Z =	3.42 (P = 0.0006))					
02 Orthopedic Surgery							
Munro et al, 2002	20	301.00(63.00)	15	331.00(62.00)		100.00	-30.00 [-71.79, 11.79]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	20		15			100.00	-30.00 [-71.79, 11.79]
Test for heterogeneity: not	applicable						
Test for overall effect: Z =	1.41 (P = 0.16)						
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			-100 -50 0 50	100	
					Favours Ketorolac Favours Pl	acebo	

Figure 1-21. Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Micrograms of Fentanyl Required in Recovery Room

Review: 1 Comparison: 0 Outcome: 0	The Role of Intravenou 15 Rescue Dosing - Ke 12 Micrograms of fenta	itravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review osing - Ketorolac vs Placebo is of fentanyl required for pain control in recovery room							
Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl		
Sutters et al, 199	19 36	5 19.71(31.46)	32	46.50(58.95)		100.00	-26.79 [-49.65, -3.93]		
Total (95% Cl) Test for heteroger Test for overall eff	36 neity: not applicable fect: Z = 2.30 (P = 0.0)	5 2)	32		-	100.00	-26.79 [-49.65, -3.93]		
		·			-100 -50 0 Fayours Ketorolac Fayo	50 100			

MANUSCRIPT TWO

SYSTEMATICALLY IMPROVING YOUR PRACTICE

Abstract

Aims: To help nurse practitioners ask a clear clinical question using the PICO method of question formulation; and to inform practitioners about sources of systematic reviews.

Background: No practitioner can keep up with the current volume of literature that is released by journals and the internet. When searching for literature pertinent to a clinical question, practitioners should rely more on summaries of the evidence such as systematic reviews.

Conclusions: Knowing how to ask clear questions and understanding about systematic reviews, how to locate them, and how to apply them to the clinical setting will allow practitioners to provide the best possible care to their patients in an effective and efficient manner.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

SYSTEMATICALLY IMPROVING YOUR PRACTICE

Introduction

Much has been said about evidence-based practice lately. Evidence based practice means that practitioners should be aware of current evidence and use it to provide care (Hamer & Collinson, 2005). The need for practice to be informed by evidence is essential for advanced nurse practitioners. The reality is that few nurse practitioners have time to search for and read thousands of articles, then pool the information and determine the implications for practice. This is where use of high quality filtered evidence should become an integral part of a nurse practitioners practice. By filtered we mean that a skilled researcherclinician has evaluated the literature and prepared a summary. Reading a few summaries on a research topic is far more feasible than reading thousands of articles.

Although filtered evidence can take a several forms, an important one for nurse practitioners is the systematic review. High quality systematic reviews (SR) are designed to be a summary of all of the available literature on a topic. To prepare a SR, the researcher uses explicit methods that allow the authors to conduct an exhaustive search of the literature, critically appraise the findings, and synthesize the information into a clear and precise summary. Systematic reviews employ strict criteria to limit or eliminate bias and error that can be found in single studies and in studies about infrequent disease outcomes (Straus, Richardson, Glasziou, & Haynes, 2005). Quantitative reviews may include a meta-analysis, which is a combination of the statistical results from several

different studies. SRs may also be carried out on qualitative studies and may include meta-synthesis, a method of combining qualitative study results (DiCenso, Guyatt, & Ciliska, 2005).

Asking the right clinical question

A key to providing evidence based healthcare is the ability to define a clear and succinct question (DiCenso et al., 2005). This allows practitioners to perform a precise literature search which will produce the most current literature on the subject. One method that is guick and easy to use is termed the "PICO" method of question development. PICO stands for "Population", "Intervention", "Control", and "Outcome." Population is defined as the people or participants of interest. Interventions are what treatment option is being considered and control refers to the comparison. Often the comparison would be the treatment that is considered the "gold standard" for the given situation. Outcome refers to what is hoped to be achieved by the intervention (i.e. remission, cure, pain control, etc.). By using the PICO method of question formation, not only is a clear question created, but the key or MeSH terms that should be used when conducting a search of the various databases are also identified. For example, imagine you have a 14 year old diabetic girl in clinic whose parents are asking about using the alvcemic index for weight loss. You search for articles from 1996 to 2006 in MEDLINE, which is one database of health publications, using the terms "diabetes" and "diet." MEDLINE tells you that 8718 articles have been published on the topic of diabetes and diet. If the PICO method is used to create the clinical question, "adolescent diabetic patients" would be the population, "glycemic index

diet" would be the intervention, no diet would be the comparison, and "weight loss" would be the desired outcome. Using the key words as MeSH terms, the results are significantly more manageable (2 publications on the topic). The PICO method is extremely useful when searching for SRs or for general searches when a SR is not available.

Finding systematic reviews

When looking for high quality systematic reviews, it is important that practitioners look for SRs that are peer reviewed and published by credible sources. Practitioners can locate high quality SRs online, depending on the resources subscribed to by their employers.

Cochrane Library

The Cochrane Library (<u>www.cochrane.org</u>) contains the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR) which includes a regularly updated data base of completed systematic reviews as well as proposals for reviews to be completed in the near future. The Cochrane library also contains the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE), which are systematic reviews that are published outside of the Cochrane database.

<u>CINAHL – Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health</u>

CINAHL provides medical information specifically for nursing and allied health. Access to CINAHL requires a subscription. You can search for relevant SRs by setting the limit on publication types to systematic reviews.

<u>MEDLINE</u>

Many institutions have access to MEDLINE. Searches can be limited to SRs by selecting the "EBM Reviews" limitation.

Joanna Briggs Institute

The Joanna Briggs Institute (<u>www.joannabriggs.edu.au</u>) is affiliated with the University of Adelaide. The site offers easy to read summaries based on the results of systematic reviews. Some of the SRs are free of charge, and others require membership that can be purchased by individuals or institutions. SRs can be found on the website by selecting the "Members area" drop down menu, then "Educational" and "Systematic Reviews".

Sarah Cole Hirsh Institutes for Best Nursing Based on Evidence

The website (http://fpb.case.edu/HirshInstitute/reviews.shtm) contains systematic reviews that are focused specifically on nursing issues. The SRs are completed by faculty members and students and use nationally recognized experts to evaluate each systematic review.

National Quality Measures Clearinghouse

The National Quality Measures Clearinghouse (NQMC) is a web site for information on specific evidence-based health care quality measures and measure sets. NQMC (<u>www.qualitymeasures.ahrq.gov</u>) will allow you to access systematic reviews without requiring a membership. It is easy to use and can be searched by key terms or by treatment/intervention or disease/condition.

<u>Google</u>

Google provides access to systematic reviews by adding "+ systematic review" to the subject. It results in a large number of hits that require some time to browse through, but it is accessible from any internet ready computer.

Incorporating systematic reviews into practice

If asking the right question and locating systematic reviews is half the battle of providing evidence based information to patients, applying the results in a clinical setting is the other half. Through compilation of various studies, systematic reviews provide a well rounded estimate of the true effects of a clinical intervention. With that being said, they are not always applicable to specific clinical situations, patient populations, or diagnosis. When deciding to implement the results of a systematic review into practice, it is imperative that the practitioner consider the following three issues, 1) Is the recommended treatment reasonable for the clinical setting, 2) Does this systematic review apply to this particular clinical situation/patient and 3) Does the recommendation fall in line with the patients values?

Reasonable for Clinical Setting

When considering the results of any systematic review, the practitioner must determine if the findings are reasonable, or even possible for the particular situation. For example, a northern nurse practitioner may be asking what to do for an infant whose head size is crossing percentiles. MRI is recommended. It would not be possible to have this done as the next step; however, it would be

possible to make a referral to a center that has MRI capabilities to ensure that the child receives the best possible treatment.

Applicability to Individual Patients/Clinical Situation

It is not possible to find a systematic review that will perfectly match both patient and potential diagnosis for every clinical question. It is up to the practitioner to determine if the patient populations of the review or the diagnosis/treatment being considered are similar enough for the study to be relevant to the current situation. If the variations from the study to reality could potentially lead to the recommendations causing the patient harm it is the practitioners' responsibility to look for a more similar systematic review, or not implement the recommendations of the review.

Patient Values and Beliefs

Even with a systematic review that closely meets a clinical situation, and has clear statistically significant results, applying the results may not be in congruence with the patients' values and beliefs. In this situation it is important for practitioners to work with patients to ensure that they fully understand the recommendations that are being made and the literature that supports treatment recommendations. Patients should be aware of the potential risks and benefits of the recommended treatment. If the patient is well informed but the recommended course of action is against a closely held value or belief, then it is the practitioners' responsibility to explore other avenues of treatments that may be more acceptable to the patients needs.

Conclusion

Systematic reviews are an invaluable tool for advanced nurse practitioners and their patients. With the rapid advances in medical treatment and technology, advanced nurse practitioners in all clinical settings must know how to develop a clinical question, and must have access to database that provides up-to-date and peer-reviewed systematic reviews. It is the practitioner's responsibility to be aware of where to find systematic reviews and when it is reasonable to apply them. Accessing systematic reviews will enable nurse practitioners to base their practice on research driven information, providing their patients with high quality information that will allow them to make the best possible decisions for themselves or their loved ones.

References

- DiCenso, A., Guyatt, G., & Ciliska, D. (2005). *Evidence based nursing : A guide to clinical practice*. St. Louis, Mo. ; London: Mosby.
- Straus, S. E., Richardson, W. S., Glasziou, P., & Haynes, R. B. (2005). *Evidence-based medicine: How to practice and teach EBM* (3rd ed.).
 Toronto: Elsevier Churchill Livingstone.

GENERAL DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

To conclude, each of the three objectives of this thesis project has been achieved. First, the risk of side effects associated with intravenous ketorolac was evaluated through the systematic review and meta-analysis. The results do not support the belief that intravenous ketorolac causes more post-operative bleeding events than intravenous opioids. These results require practitioners to reconsider excluding the drug from their formulary based on this unfounded belief. As well, incidence of post-operative nausea and vomiting was significantly less in the ketorolac group than in the opioid counterpart. Any patients who are undergoing surgery that may be compromised by post-operative emesis should be given intravenous ketorolac over intravenous opioids to protect the surgical site.

Second, the meta-analysis shows that intravenous ketorolac is equivalent to intravenous opioids for controlling mild to moderate post-operative pain in most situations. It is not clear why opioids out-perform ketorolac in day-surgery. This is a matter for further investigation. Outside of day-surgery, ketorolac could be a first line of defense against post-operative pain and less likely than opioids to cause nausea and vomiting.

The third objective was met by providing practitioners with quick and easy ways to formulate a clinical question, and find appropriate systematic reviews to meet their patient's clinical needs.

60

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.
Implications for Advanced Nurse Practitioners

Advanced nurse practitioners need to utilize systematic reviews as a way to assimilate the vast amount of literature that is available and updated on a frequent basis. Decisions for care should be based on all of the available literature, not just the most popular published trials. The basis for this systematic review is an excellent example of how a meta-analysis, especially when sample sizes are small, can lead to skewed results. In areas, such as pediatrics, where large event rates and large sample sizes do not happen often, research findings need to be pooled to come up with the best possible evidence for dealing with clinical problems.

The roles of advanced nurse practitioners are advancing at a rapid pace. As advance nurse practitioners break new ground, they need to ensure that they are doing so in an informed and educated manner. Developing clinical research skills in order to obtain and understand current research is essential to all practitioners' practices. Skills and resources need to be readily taught and available in all clinical settings in order to provide the best possible care to the public.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Summary of Meta-analysis Findings	63
Appendix B. The role of ketorolac and intravenous opioid in the	65

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Page

APPENDIX A - Summary of Meta-Analysis Findings

	Statistically Significant	Not Statistically Significant
Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Any reported post-operative bleeding	event	
Any post-operative bleeding event		×
Tonsillectomy patients		×
Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains	Favors Ketorolac	
	WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91	
Post-operative bleeding times		×
Patients requiring re-admission/re-operation due to bleeding		*
High dose versus low dose ketorolac		×
Dose duration <24 hours versus >24 hours		×
Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Any reported post-operative naus	sea and vomiting	
Any post-operative nausea and vomiting	Favors Ketorolac	
	RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77	
	NNT=5.79	
Strabismus repair patients	Favors Ketorolac	
	RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53	
	<u>NNT=2.83</u>	
Tonsillectomy patients		*
Day surgery patients	Favors Ketorolac	
	RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61	
	NNT=3.55	
High dose ketorolac	Favors Ketorolac	
	RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78	
	NNT=5.68	
Inpatients	ana ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang ang	X
Low dose ketorolac		*
Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - In minutes		
Discharge from recovery room or PARR		×
Discharge from hospital		*
Ketorolac vs Placebo – In minutes		*
Discharge from recovery room or PARR	Favors Ketorolac	
	WMD=-10.62, 95% CI -71.97 to -11.75	9
Pain Scores – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - First reported pain scores		
Objective pain scale		×
Day surgery patients	Favors Opioids	×
	WMD=0.63, 95% CI 0.16 to 1.10	

APPENDIX A - Summary of Meta-Analysis Findings Cont.

	Statistically Significant	Not Statistically Significant
Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Requiring any post-operative dosing		
Any post-operative rescue dosing		×
-Ketorolac vs. Placebo		×
Micrograms of fentanyl required in recovery room	Favors Ketorolac WMD=-27.26, 95% CI -49.65 to -3.93	

APPENDIX B

THE ROLE OF KETOROLAC AND INTRAVENOUS OPIOID IN THE POST-OPERATIVE PEDIATRIC PATIENT: A SYSTEMATIC REVIEW

Background to the Research

Trauma resulting from surgical intervention will always cause some form of post-operative discomfort (Anthony & Jasinski, 2002). Without proper control, this discomfort can escalate to unbearable pain and impede healing and basic functioning of the patient. Managing post-operative pain in the pediatric population presents its own unique set of issues and concerns.

Too often, children experience less than optimal pain management. The causes of sub-optimal pain management are complex and include the child's age, clinical decision making, myths about pain and parental fears. Young children are often unable to vocalize their pain and their need for analgesics (Carney, Nicolette, Ratner, Minerd, & Baesl, 2001) leaving parents and health care professionals to guess the amount of pain medication necessary to keep the child comfortable. Health professionals have a tendency to underestimate or ignore the pain children experience (Schechter, 1999). Inadequate use of analgesics, inability to provide analgesics in a timely manner, and failure to communicate evaluations of pain treatments amongst staff lead to inadequate treatment of pain (Dahl, 2002 Aug; Jacob & Puntillo, 2000 Jul; Rutledge, Donaldson, & Pravikoff, 2002). Ignorance of drug side effects and myths of addiction related to analgesics have resulted in fear of administering analgesics to children. Practitioners' fears of respiratory depression, nausea and vomiting,

decreased level of consciousness, ileus and urinary retention frequently associated with opioid administration contribute to the routine sub-therapeutic dosing of opioids in pediatrics (Carney et al., 2001). Parents' fears of "overdosing" children on pain medication, or having children become addicted to opioids also contribute to the inadequate administration of pain medication (Anysley-Green, 1996).

Inadequate treatment of pain in children can have side effects involving the cardiovascular, respiratory, endocrine, metabolic, genitourinary, gastrointestinal, and immune systems (McCaffery & Pasero, 1999). Children may also manifest cognitive and behavioral problems as a direct side effect of uncontrolled pain (Kain et al., 2004 Dec).

With non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) now available in intravenous form as ketorolac (Toradol[™]), clinicians who are caring for children's post-operative pain may find a role for non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs. These may be the drugs of choice when clinicians are concerned about side effects from opioids, such as respiratory depression, (Watcha et al., 1992, Lieh-Lai et al., 1999, Maunuksela et al., 1992, Carney et al., 2001, Anthony & Jasinski, 2002, Mather & Mckie, 1983, Schechter et al., 1986) nausea and vomiting (Watcha et al., 1992, Lieh-Lai et al., 1999, Carney et al., 2001, Anthony et al., 2002, Keidan et al., 2004, Mendel et al., 1995, Munro et al., 2002, Munro et al., 1994, Romsing, J., 1998, Romsing et al., 1997, Shende, D., 1999), decreased level of consciousness, ileus and urinary retention (Carney et al., 2001, Munro et al., 1994 & Romsing et al., 1997). With the development of

ketorolac. NSAIDs can now be administered intravenously. Ketorolac provides analgesic effects similar to opioids when used for mild to moderate pain (Watcha et al., 1992, Carnev et al., 2001, Mendel et al., 1995, Munro et al., 1994, Munro et al., 2002, Romsing, J., 1998, Shende, D., 1999, Bean-Lijewski & Hunt, 1996, Chauhan et al., 2001, Gunter et al., 1995, Gupta et al., 2005). It also has the added benefits of having anti-pyretic and anti-inflammatory properties (Pendeville, P.E., 1995). On the negative side, clinicians believe that intravenous ketorolac increases risk of post-operative bleeding and many are hesitant to use it (Romsing, J., 1998, Bean-Lijewski & Hunt, 1996, Gunter et al., 1995, Gupta et al., 2005, Judkins et al., 1996, Marret, E., 2004, Rusy et al., 1995, & Splinter et al., 1996). The belief that intravenous NSAIDs increase the risk of post-operative bleeding has arisen from the results of several studies. A single dose of ketorolac increased major post-operative bleeding enough to suggest that it is contraindicated in pediatric adeno-tonsillectomy patients (Gunter et al., 1995). Ketorolac has been reported to increase the number of post-operative bleeding events and the risk of a child experiencing major bleeding episode following tonsillectomy (Gunter et al., 1995). It has also been linked to increased bleeding time (Bean-Lijewski & Hunt, 1996). The results of these studies and a metaanalysis (Marret et al., 2003) of studies of pediatric tonsillectomy led to recommendations that ketorolac not be given to pediatric patients following tonsillectomy.

A systematic review and meta-analysis completed in 2003 by Marret et al led to the recommendation that ketorolac not be used at all in any post-operative

tonsillectomy patients. However, concerns have been raised by Dsida and Cote (2004) over the quality of the study and the method of data pooling used in the Marret et al meta-analysis. The search for studies for inclusion in the systematic review examined only two databases (MEDLINE and CCTR), excluded all non-English studies, and used a quality of study ranking system which eliminated studies that were thought to be of low quality. The seven studies included in the review had some important variations. The samples included adults and children. Other variations in techniques included: route of administration (oral and parental), number or length of doses (one dose to two weeks of doses), and onset of NSAID treatment (upon completion of surgery or at time of discharge home). These methodological variations can affect the meta-analysis.

Ketorolac is currently available to practitioners caring for patients who have undergone a wide variety of surgical procedures. The many differences between children and adults require that study selection exclude adults when the focus of the review is a pediatric matter. It is appropriate to complete a metaanalysis to examine the risks and benefits ketorolac may have for all postoperative pediatric patients. A more thorough literature search than the previous meta-analysis completed is necessary to ensure that all available relevant research has been included. Subgroup analysis including, high dose ketorolac versus low dose ketorolac, length of treatment and day surgery patients compared to inpatients will provide a more thorough analysis on which practitioners can base prescribing decisions.

Many excellent reviews have been published about the use of NSAIDs and their effects on postoperative pain in pediatrics (Di Massa, Scardigli, Bruni, & Valentino, 2000 Oct; Forrest, Heitlinger, & Revell, 1997 May; Resman-Targoff, 1990 Nov; J. Romsing & Walther-Larsen, 1997 Jul). With an absence of information about safety and efficacy of intravenous ketorolac in the pediatric population, a systematic review of the literature is appropriate and will potentially shed some light on the question.

Objectives

To examine the role of intravenous ketorolac with regard to safety, side effects, and analgesic benefit in comparison to intravenous opioids or placebo in the post-operative pediatric population.

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of participants

This review considered trials involving children less than 18 years of age, of both sexes and all ethnic origins. Children had to be undergoing a surgical procedure that required post-operative intravenous analgesics either as inpatients or day surgery patients. Studies that enrolled children and adults would be included if the data for the children had been separated from that of the adults. Where data for children was not separated from adults, an attempt was made to contact the author to see if the information was available.

Types of interventions

The interventions assessed were post-operative intravenous ketorolac administration, in combination with, or compared to either intravenous opioids or

an intravenous placebo. Doses had to follow standard pediatric dosage guidelines, and could be either a single or multiple doses.

Types of outcome measures

The primary outcome measures of the review were selected a priori:

- Pain experienced by the children post-operatively as assessed by selfreport or observation (using any pain scale).
 - A. Self report scales are used for children 3 years of age and older who can rank their pain using validated scales such as:
 - a. Faces scale: six cartoon faces showing increasing degrees of distress. Faces 0 signifies "no hurt" and face 5 the "worst hurt you can imagine". The child chooses the face that best describes his or her own pain at the time of assessment. .
 - b. Visual analogue scale (VAS) uses a 10 cm line with one end marked as no pain and the opposite end marked as the worst pain. The child makes a mark on the line to illustrate the pain experience. A measure is taken of the distance along the line to the child's mark.
 - B. Observational scales are the primary method of pain assessment for infants and children less than 3 yrs old, and for those with developmental disabilities. Validated tools include:
 - a. CRIES: Assesses crying, oxygen requirement, increased vital signs, facial expression.

- b. FLACC: (Face, Legs, Activity, Crying, Consolability scale).
 The scale is used with children from 2 months to 7 years.
 The score can range from 0-10.
- c. CHEOPS: (Children's Hospital of Eastern Ontario Pain Scale) is intended for children 1-7 yrs old. It assesses cry, facial expression, verbalization, torso movement, if child touches affected site, and position of legs. A score ≥ 4 signifies pain.

Secondary outcome measures addressed were:

- 1. The need for "rescue" dosing and/or adjunctive pain medications.
- Adverse reactions, focusing specifically on post-operative nausea and vomiting and bleeding. Nausea and vomiting included any recorded postoperative nausea and vomiting event. Bleeding events included any reported post-operative bleeding event, milliliters of blood loss in postoperative drains and the need for re-admission or re-operation due to bleeding.
- Post-operative maladaptive behavioral changes including behavioral changes, agitation levels, and changes in sleeping patterns (Kain et al., 2004 Dec).
- 4. Time to discharge from recovery room or from hospital in minutes.

Types of studies

This review considered only randomized controlled trials. The trials could be of any design (e.g. cross-over or not) and could be published or unpublished. Language restrictions were not imposed.

Search Strategy for identification of studies

A comprehensive search strategy was developed for each database. The search strategy below was developed for MEDLINE and was appropriately adapted for each additional database. Terms were confirmed with a professional librarian who specializes in systematic review search in medicine and the health sciences.

1. opioid.mp. or exp Narcotics

Analgesics, Non-Narcotic/ or analgesics.mp. or exp Analgesics/ or Analgesics,
 Opioid

3. morphine.mp. or exp Morphine/ or Morphine Derivatives

4. (dilaudid or hydromorphone).mp. [mp=title, original title, abstract, name of substance word, subject heading word]

5. (meperidine or pethidine or demerol).mp. [mp=title, original title, abstract,

name of substance word, subject heading word]

6. fentanyl.mp. or exp Fentanyl

7. 437-38-7.rn.

8. 57-27-2.rn.

9. (466-99-9 or 71-68-1).rn.

10. (57-42-1 or 50-13-5 or 28097-96-3).rn.

11. or/1-10

12. Ketorolac Tromethamine/ or exp Ketorolac/ or ketorolac.mp.

13. toradol.mp. or exp Ketorolac Tromethamine

14. (74103-06-3 or 74103-07-4).rn.

15. or/12-14

16. 11 and 15

17. limit 16 to "all child (0 to 18 years)"

Databases searched include: EBM-Reviews-Cochrane central register of controlled trials (up to the 4th quarter of 2005), EBM Reviews - Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (up to the 4th quarter of 2005), Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews: Cochrane Library, (current library as of January 2006), Cochrane Pain, Palliative and Supportive Group Register: (current issue as of January 2006), MEDLINE: (1966-January, 2006), PubMed: (1966 - January, 2006), EMBASE: (1988- January, 2006), CINAHL: (1982-January, 2006), Web of Science: (1975-January 2006), AMED: (1985-January, 2006), EBM Reviews: (1991-January, 2006), International Pharmaceutical Abstracts (1970-January, 2006),. MD Consult: (current database up to January, 2006), National Guideline Clearinghouse (US): (current database up to January, 2006), SAM Online: (current database up to January, 2006), Dissertation Abstracts: 1986-January, 2006), Biosis (current database up to January, 2006), Google Scholar (first 100 hits as of January 26, 2006), Pascal (current database up to January, 2006), SCOPUS(current database up to January, 2006), Clinical

Evidence(current database up to January, 2006), MEDLINE in Process(current database up to January, 2006), EBMR (current database up to January, 2006), Alberta Heritage Foundation for medical Research (AHFMR): www.ahfmr.ab.ca (current database up to January, 2006), Therapeutics Initiative: www.ti.ubc.ca (current database up to January, 2006), Current Controlled Trials: www.controlled-trials.com (current database up to January, 2006), CenterWatch: www.centerwatch.com (current database up to January, 2006), Clinical Study Results: <u>http://clinicalstudyresults.org</u> (current database up to January, 2006), Clinicaltrials.gov: http://clinicaltrials.gov (current database up to January, 2006), International Register of Clinical Trials Registers: www.trialscentral.org (current database up to January, 2006), Alberta Research Centre for Child Health Evidence (ARCHE): <u>www.ualberta.ca/ARCHE/reviews.html</u> (current database up to January, 2006), and reference lists of articles. The primary authors of the articles who met the basic criteria of the review were also contacted by email or letter to inquire about any published or unpublished articles about which they may have been aware.

Method of the review

Study Selection

Titles, abstracts and medical search headings (MeSH) of all reports identified in the initial search were examined by one reviewer and the full text articles were obtained for the studies that appeared to meet the following inclusion criteria:

a. Patients were children aged 18 years or less

- b. Study evaluated both intravenous ketorolac and either an intravenous opioid or an intravenous placebo.
- c. Study was looking at children immediately post-operatively as either an inpatient or day surgery patient

Two reviewers then conducted an in-depth review of the articles to determine whether or not they should be included in the review. Disagreements were resolved by discussion before quality assessment and data extraction occurred.

Quality Assessment

Quality of all included studies was assessed by two independent reviewers at the time of data extraction. All studies were examined using the allocation concealment method and the Jadad scale (Jadad et al., 1996 Feb). This method rates a trial on a scale of A through D. "A" indicates that the randomization technique is adequate (i.e. centralized by telephone or computer system). "B" indicates that the concealment is unclear (i.e. sealed envelopes, but not sequentially numbered or opaque). "C" indicates that the concealment method was inadequate (i.e. open list of random numbers, or day of week), and "D" indicates that allocation concealment was not used.

The Jadad scale (Jadad et al., 1996 Feb) is a five point scale where a point is allocated if, a) the study is described as randomized b) the method of randomization is well described and appropriate c) study outcome assessment is blinded d) the method of blinding is well described and appropriate and e) a description of withdrawals and dropouts from the study is provided. The scale requires the deduction of one point if methods for randomization or blinding are

inappropriate. Reviewers were not blind to the trial authors, institutions or journal name during the study selection or quality assessment process.

Data Extraction

Data were extracted from included studies by two reviewers who used a data extraction form designed for this review. The reviewers extracted the data independently and then compared the data to ensure no discrepancies.

Eight studies included in this review were either missing data relevant to the study or provided data that could not be combined with data from other studies (Keidan, Zaslansky, Eviatar, Segal, & Sarfaty, 2004; Lieh-Lai, Kauffman, Uy, Danjin, & Simpson, 1999; Maunuksela, Kokki, & Bullingham, 1992; Munro, Riegger, Reynolds, Wilton, & Lewis, 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; Pendeville et al., 1995) For example, Pendeville et al. (1995) reported a mean age of 18.6 years (± 3.8 years), but was unable to provide the raw data on those subjects less than 18 years of age.

Additional information was sought from all of the authors via email and/or letter. Five authors responded, but none had access to the data required for the study to be included in the review.

Where means and standard deviations were not available, they were computed using information provided in the article (graph's, figures, or calculated from ranges.)

Data Analysis

All data were analyzed using a statistical package (RevMan 4.2.8) provided by the Cochrane Collaboration. A random effects model was used to examine heterogeneity among studies with a 95% confidence interval. Heterogeneity was analyzed quantitatively using the I-squared statistic provided by the RevMan software. I-squared statistics examine the variability in the analysis due to between study variability as opposed to within study variability (Brady-Fryer, Wiebe, & Lander, 2004). An I-square greater than 50% is considered large.

When homogeneity among two or more studies was thought to occur, data were pooled using a fixed effects model. Dichotomous data were analyzed and reported as relative risk ratios (RR) with a 95% confidence interval and a fixed effects model. Where small event rates occurred, Peto odds ratio was used with a fixed effects model.

Continuous data were analyzed and reported as weighted means differences (WMD) where the units examined were combinable. When the units were incompatible, the standardized mean difference (SMD) was computed.

Description of the studies

The initial search identified 1637 publications. A review of abstracts led to exclusion of 1564 of these publications for at least one of the following reasons: adult subjects (n=647), non-randomized controlled trial (n=503), non-human subjects (n=34), ketorolac used as an adjunctive medication (n=380). Eighty-eight full text articles were obtained and reviewed by two independent reviewers. An additional 73 studies were excluded from the review for the following reasons:

non-randomized controlled trials (n=33), adult patients (n=17) and nonintravenous route of drug administration (n=23). One other study was excluded because the pediatric data could not be separated from the adult data ²⁰. Reference lists of the full text articles were examined to make certain that the search was complete. The authors were contacted and asked if they were aware about any published or unpublished articles on the topic of the systematic review. Figure A-1 illustrates the selection and exclusion of studies for this systematic review.



Figure A-1. Summary of article selection process.

```
78
```

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fifteen studies were included in this systematic review yielding 1022 postoperative pediatric patients requiring intravenous pain mediations (Chiaretti et al., 1997; Gunter et al., 1995; Gupta et al., 2005; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; Purday, Reichert, & Merrick, 1996; J. Romsing, 1998; Shende, 1999; Sutters, Shaw, Gerardi, & Hebert, 1999; Watcha, Jones, Lagueruela, Schweiger, & White, 1992). None of the studies included patients less than 1 year of age. Where reported, patients' ASA status was 1 or 2. Details of each study are given in the Table A-2 - characteristics of included studies.

Seven of the studies compared intravenous ketorolac with opioids (Chiaretti et al., 1997; Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999), five compared with placebo (Gupta et al., 2005; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; J. Romsing, 1998; Sutters et al., 1999), and three compared with both (Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Watcha et al., 1992). For the trials including a placebo, identical volumes of normal saline were used for comparison and in all cases the subjects received another form of pain medication.

Fourteen of the studies provided information on post-operative pain although in various ways (Chiaretti et al., 1997; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; Purday et al., 1996; J. Romsing, 1998; Shende, 1999). Some of the studies measured pain in more than one way.

Fourteen studies provided information on the need for "rescue dosing" or adjunctive medications post operatively (Gunter et al., 1995; Gupta et al., 2005; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; Purday et al., 1996; J. Romsing, 1998; Shende, 1999; Sutters et al., 1999; Watcha et al., 1992).

Eleven studies reported post-operative bleeding events (Gunter et al., 1995; Gupta et al., 2005; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Mendel et al., 1995; Park et al., 2000; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999; Sutters et al., 1999; Watcha et al., 1992). Two studies reported milliliters of blood loss (Munro et al., 2002; J. Romsing, 1998).

Seven studies reported time to discharge from hospital (Gunter et al., 1995; Gupta et al., 2005; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Purday et al., 1996; Sutters et al., 1999) and four reported time to discharge from the recovery room (Gunter et al., 1995; Munro et al., 2002; Purday et al., 1996; Watcha et al., 1992).

Thirteen studies reported post-operative nausea and vomiting events (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; Purday et al., 1996; J. Romsing, 1998; Shende, 1999; Sutters et al., 1999; Watcha et al., 1992). One study reported on post-operative maladaptive behaviors (Keidan et al., 2004).

Methodological quality

All of the studies included in the review were described as randomized controlled trials. Thirteen of the studies had an allocation concealment that was unclear, making it difficult to ensure that the randomization was completely blinded (Chiaretti et al., 1997; Gunter et al., 1995; Gupta et al., 2005; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; Purday et al., 1996; J. Romsing, 1998; Shende, 1999). Only two of the included studies had an allocation concealment method that was deemed adequate (Gunter et al., 1995; Sutters et al., 1999) (see table A-2– Characteristics of Included Studies).

Nine studies were considered to be of high quality when evaluated using a Jadad score \geq 3 (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Munro et al., 2002; Park et al., 2000; J. Romsing, 1998; Sutters et al., 1999; Watcha et al., 1992). Only one study received a Jadad score of 4 (Gunter et al., 1995). Of the six low quality studies, four studies received a score of 2, (Chiaretti et al., 1997; Gupta et al., 2005; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996) and two studies received a score of 1 (Mendel et al., 1995; Shende, 1999).

Results

Ketorolac versus opioid comparisons

Results are presented in six main categories 1) pain 2) "rescue dosing" or PRN medications 3) time to discharge 4) post-operative nausea and vomiting 5) bleeding events and 6) post-operative maladaptive behaviors. Subgroup

analyses for each category are presented in Figure 1-2, which is a flow diagram summarizing ketorolac versus opioid comparisons. The results reported on the following pages are summarized in Table A-1.





1. Pain Scores

a. Observational pain scales

The Objective Pain Scale is an observational pain scale. Although this scale has not been psychometrically developed, it was widely used by researchers who investigated the use of ketorolac. Scores can range from 0-10, zero being no or minimal pain and ten being severe pain. A score of 0-2 is applied to the following five categories, 1) blood pressure (increased by 10%, 10-20%, 20-30%, 2) crying (not crying, crying but consolable, inconsolable), 3) moving (none, restless, thrashing), 4) agitation (calm, mild, hysterical), and 5) verbal response or body language (asleep or states had no pain, unable to localize or states had mild pain, localizes or state has moderate to severe pain). Four trials (Mendel et al., 1995; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999; Watcha et al., 1992) examined pain scores using the objective pain scale. No statistically significant differences were found for pain for ketorolac versus opioids (see Figures A-4).

One study (Lieh-Lai et al., 1999) used a unique observational pain scale when comparing Ketorolac with opioids. *P*ain scores did not differ when comparing ketorolac and opioids (see Figure A-5).

2. Rescue Dosing

Seven studies (Gunter et al., 1995; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999) examined the need for adjunctive pain medication or "rescue dosing" in the

post operative period and found no statistical significance when ketorolac was compared with opioids (see Figure A-6).

No statistical difference was found when comparing ketorolac versus opioids in tonsillectomy patients (see Figure A-6). (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004) ,strabismus repair patients (see Figure A-6). (Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Shende, 1999) inpatients versus (Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992) day surgery patients (see Figure A-7)(Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999) or the use of high dose Ketorolac (>=0.6 mg/kg/dose) (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999) versus low dose Ketorolac (<=0.5 mg/kg/dose) (see Figure A-8) (Maunuksela et al., 1992) . No statistical difference was found for ketorolac and opioids in studies that examined intra- or pre-operative administration of ketorolac (Keidan et al., 2004; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999) with postoperative administration (see Figure A-9) (Gunter et al., 1995; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992).

3. Time to discharge

Three studies (Gunter et al., 1995; Purday et al., 1996; Watcha et al., 1992) provided information on discharge time from the recovery room or PARR. No statistical difference was found in discharge time for the opioid and ketorolac groups (see Figure A-10).

Five studies (Gunter et al., 1995; Gupta et al., 2005; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996) provided data about time to discharge from hospital. This was not statistically different for ketorolac when compared with opioids (see Figure A-11), nor was it significant when ketorolac and opioids were compared for time to discharge for inpatients or day surgery patients (see Figure A-12).

4. Nausea and Vomiting

Data about nausea and vomiting were included in nine studies (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999; Watcha et al., 1992). Those who received ketorolac versus opioids had significantly less nausea and vomiting (RR=0.63; 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77). The number needed to treat (NNT) was 6 (see Figure A-13).

Subgroup analysis of three studies examining patients undergoing strabismus repair surgery show a statistically significant favoring of Ketorolac over opioids in reducing nausea and vomiting post-operatively (RR=0.28; 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53, NNT=3) (see Figure A-13). However the occurrence of nausea and vomiting for ketorolac and opioids did not differ in studies of tonsillectomies (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004) (see Figure A-13).

Studies providing data on day surgery patients (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 2002; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999) showed a statistically significant reduction in the amount of postoperative nausea and vomiting for ketorolac (RR 0.48; 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61,

NNT=4), whereas the three studies examining inpatients (Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Maunuksela et al., 1992; Watcha et al., 1992) did not (see Figure A-14).

High doses of ketorolac ($\geq 0.6 \text{ mg/kg}$) were examined in eight studies (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Mendel et al., 1995; Munro et al., 1994; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999; Watcha et al., 1992). Significantly less nausea and vomiting in the ketorolac group versus the opioid comparison was found (RR=0.63, 95%Cl 0.51 to 0.78). Maunuksela et al. (1992) examined low dose ketorolac ($\leq 0.5 \text{ mg/kg}$) and did not find a statistical difference between ketorolac and opioids (see Figure A-15).

5. Bleeding events

No statistical difference in bleeding for ketorolac and opioids was found among the eight studies(see Figure A-16) (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004; Lieh-Lai et al., 1999; Mendel et al., 1995; Purday et al., 1996; Shende, 1999; Watcha et al., 1992). No difference in bleeding occurred for tonsillectomy (see Figure A-16) (Gunter et al., 1995; Keidan et al., 2004), or strabismus repair (see Figure A-16) (Mendel et al., 1995; Shende, 1999).

Gupta et al., (2005) examined milliliters of blood loss in drains postoperatively. The analysis identified a statistically significant difference (WMD -3.20 (95% CI -5.49 to -0.91) favoring the use of ketorolac (see Figure A-17). While it is true that this meta-analyses indicated significantly greater loss of blood (as measured in a drain), the results cannot be considered to be conclusive. Only a single study with a small sample size (n=35 per group) was available for

analysis. Mean bleeding time did not provide a statistical difference between ketorolac and opioids (see Figure A-18) (Lieh-Lai et al., 1999).

No statistical difference was found in bleeding for ketorolac and opioids for the following: re-operation or readmission to hospital (see Figure A-19), inpatients versus outpatients (see Figure A-20), or high dose versus low dose ketorolac (see Figure A-21).

The half life of ketorolac is approximately 2 hours, with five to six drug half lives needed to deplete the anti-platelet effect (Dsida & Cote, 2004). This led to the question, will patients who have been on the drug for only a short amount of time have less bleeding events in the overall course of their treatment than those who have been administered the drug for a prolonged period of time (duration greater than 24 hours versus less than 24 hours). The half life of ketorolac is approximately 2 hours, with it taking five to six drug half lives to deplete the anti-platelet effect (Dsida & Cote, 2004). This led to the question, will patients who have been on the drug for only a short amount of time have less bleeding events in the overall course of their treatment than those who have been administered the drug for a prolonged period, will patients who have been on the drug for only a short amount of time have less bleeding events in the overall course of their treatment than those who have been administered the drug for a prolonged period of time. No difference was found when examining bleeding events and dose duration greater than 24 hours versus less than 24 hours versus less than 24 hours (see Figure A-22).

6. Post-Operative Maladaptive Behaviors

There was no statistical difference in post-operative behavioral changes when comparing ketorolac and opioids (Keidan et al., 1995). Significantly less agitation in recovery room (RR, 1.92; 95% CI, 1.15 to 3.20) (see Figure A-23)

and less sleep disturbances the night of surgery was found in the opioid comparison group (RR, 1.76; 95% CI, 1.07 to 2.89) (see Figure A-24).





Ketorolac versus placebo comparisons

Results are presented in five main categories 1) pain scales 2) "rescue dosing" or PRN medications 3) time to discharge 4) post-operative nausea and vomiting and 5) bleeding events. Subgroup analysis for each category is presented in the flow diagram of ketorolac versus placebo comparisons (Figure A-3).

1. Pain Scales

1a. Self-Reported Pain Scales

The poker chip pain scale was used to compare ketorolac versus placebo (J. Romsing, 1998 (WMD -0.75; 95% CI -1.22 to -0.28) (see Figure A-25). Pain was significantly less in the ketorolac group versus the placebo group. When looking at self-reported post-operative bladder spasms, Park et al (2000) found that the occurrence was significantly less in the ketorolac group than the placebo comparison (RR 0.3' 95% CI, 0.11 to 0.83) (see Figure A-27).

2. Rescue Dosing

No difference was found for ketorolac versus placebo in the need for rescue dosing post-operatively (Mendel et al., 1995) (see Figure A-28). Sutters et al. (1999) examined micrograms per kilogram of fentanyl required postoperatively and found the ketorolac group favoured over the placebo group [WMD -27.26; 95% CI -49.65 to -3.93] (see Figure A-29). Thus, fentanyl requirements were lower in the ketorolac group compared to placebo group.

3. Time to Discharge

Patients receiving ketorolac compared with placebo were discharged earlier from the recovery room (Munro et al., 2002; Watcha et al., 1992) (WMD -10.62; 95% CI -71.97 to -11.79) (see Figure A-30), but not from hospital (see Figure A-31).

4. Nausea and Vomiting

Five studies (Mendel et al., 1995; Park et al., 2000; J. Romsing, 1998; Sutters et al., 1999; Watcha et al., 1992) compared ketorolac patients with placebo patients for any post-operative nausea and vomiting event, and found no statistical difference among the groups (see Figure A-32). Subgroup analysis of tonsillectomy patients (see Figure A-32), and strabismus repair patients (see Figure A-32) found no difference between ketorolac and placebo. Day surgery versus inpatients (see Figure A-33) and high dose ketorolac versus low dose ketorolac patients (see Figure A-34) also showed no difference when comparing ketorolac and placebo.

5. Bleeding Events

Five studies (Mendel et al., 1995; Park et al., 2000; J. Romsing, 1998; Sutters et al., 1999; Watcha et al., 1992) examined any bleeding event post operatively. No significant difference was found (see Figure A-35).

There was no statistical difference between placebo and ketorolac when examining intra-operative blood loss (see FigureA-36), post-operative transfusions(see Figure A-37), readmission to hospital (see Figure A-38), day

surgery versus inpatients (see Figure A-39), high dose versus lose dose ketorolac (see Figure A-40), and dose duration (>24 hours versus <24 hours) (see Figure A-41).

Discussion

This meta-analysis has produced three main findings that will be of interest to practitioners who work with post surgical pediatric patients. The first significant result is that ketorolac provides no greater risk of post-operative bleeding to patients than opioids or placebo comparisons. The second is that there is a significant reduction of nausea and vomiting in patients receiving ketorolac instead of opioids. And third is that pain control is found to be equivalent when comparing ketorolac and opioids in mild to moderate pain.

Concerns about the potential for ketorolac to cause post-operative bleeding have caused practitioners to be reluctant to prescribe it in a pediatric setting. These concerns are significant enough for the license for intra-operative use of ketorolac to be removed in the United Kingdom. This meta-analysis does not find an increased risk of post-operative bleeding when ketorolac is used. Problems with analysis in the past may have been that when analyzing studies statistically, small sample sizes and small event rates were not considered. Also, differences in surgeries, doses, and frequency and route of administration were grouped together in one analysis group inappropriately.

Ketorolac when compared with opioids is found to have a statistically significant lower incidence of and less severe post-operative vomiting. Nausea

and vomiting is an established side effect of opioids. Use of ketorolac can be beneficial for surgical procedures where post-operative retching and vomiting can be hazardous, such as with tonsillectomies, strabismus repairs and neurosurgeries.

The findings of several studies have caused a controversy about the potential for post-operative use of ketorolac to cause bleeding ^{18,25}. In fact, Gunter et al.¹⁸ elected to stop their trial early due to concerns about bleeding caused by ketorolac. This is an example of a single study, with a low frequency event, having a larger impact on clinical behavior than may be warranted. Seemingly significant findings can be caused by a number of confounds (from design problems, to inadvertent biases, to statistical methods). One possibility here is surgical skill level as some of the procedures in the Gunter et al study were carried out by surgical residents. The approach for categorizing "major bleeding" may also have created problems. The major bleeding category only involved one patient requiring re-operation in the first 24 hours. The other 4 patients required further evaluation by medical staff, with one patient being discharged from the emergency room and three admitted to hospital. It would be interesting to learn if the patients who required readmission to the hospital for major bleeding had a significant drop in post-operative hemoglobin to correlate with the diagnosis. The re-operation for the subject in the ketorolac group came on post-operative day 5 which would be difficult to attribute to the drug itself as the anti-platelet effect does not last longer than 24 hours.

Ketorolac is equivalent to opioids for pain control in mild to moderate pain, without the associated side effects of respiratory depression, bradycardia, urinary retention, or constipation found with opioid use.

Conclusions

Implications for practice

Ketorolac has been thought to be associated with post-operative bleeding and its use avoided in pediatrics. It has been removed from use in the intraoperative formulary in the United Kingdom because of the risk of bleeding. This review and meta-analysis indicate that fears about bleeding with use of ketorolac are without foundation. Ketorolac provides as good pain control as opioids do and no greater risk of bleeding. It also causes less nausea and vomiting than opioids. Ketorolac should be considered for use particularly for surgical procedures where post-operative vomiting is a concern. Patients receiving ketorolac were found to have less pain, require less rescue dosing, and a quicker discharge from recovery room, with no increase in negative side effects, than those receiving placebo. This fact should encourage practitioners to also consider prescribing ketorolac as an adjuvant to intravenous opioids for the opioids sparring effect, where they would have previously not. It should also be used in day surgery so that parents can travel home without fear that the child will vomit during the trip.

This is a good example of clinical decisions being made on the basis of individual studies. Sometimes research with small sample sizes and infrequent

events (often happening in pediatric studies) will produce results that do not stand up. A meta-analysis may help practitioners to make informed decisions for their patients in an efficient and effective manner while avoiding small event size bias.

Implications for research

Many different methods of observing and recording pain scores are used and not all of them are recognized scales. It would be beneficial for future research if pain scales were standardized so that systematic review and metaanalysis could be carried out more efficiently.

There is much debate as to whether ketorolac causes a delay in bone healing in orthopedic patients. The current research examining this concern is on animal models, or adult patients. In the future, randomized control trials of pediatric patients need to be completed in order to resolve the issue.

In this systematic review only intravenous ketorolac was examined. A systematic review about the safety, side effects and benefits of oral ketorolac when used in day surgery patients would be valuable.
References

- Anthony, D., & Jasinski, D. M. (2002). Postoperative pain management: Morphine versus ketorolac. *Journal of PeriAnesthesia Nursing*, *17*(1), 30-42.
- Anysley-Green, A. (1996). Pain and stress in infancy and childhood-where to now? *Paediatric Anaesthesia, 6*(3), 167-172.
- Bailey, R., Sinha, C., & Burgess, L. P. A. (1997). Ketorolac tromethamine and hemorrhage in tonsillectomy: A prospective, randomized, double-blind study. *Laryngoscope, 107*(2), 166-169.
- Bean, J. D., & Hunt, R. (1992). Analgesic efficacy of ketorolac in postoperative patients. *Anesth Analg, 74*, S20.
- Bean-Lijewski, J. D., & Hunt, R. D. (1996). Effect of ketorolac on bleeding time and postoperative pain in children: A double-blind, placebo-controlled comparison with meperidine. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia, 8*(1), 25-30.
- Brady-Fryer, B., Wiebe, N., & Lander, J. A. (2004). Pain relief for neonatal circumcision. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, Art. No: CD004217*(3)
- Bravo, L. J., Mattie, H., Spierdijk, J., Bovill, J. G., & Burm, A. G. (1988). The effects on ventilation of ketorolac in comparison with morphine. *European Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 35*(5), 491-494.

- Brown, C. R., Moodie, J. E., Wild, V. M., & Bynum, L. J. (1990). Comparison of intravenous ketorolac tromethamine and morphine sulfate in the treatment of postoperative pain. *Pharmacotherapy*, *10*(6 Pt 2), 116S-121S.
- Burd, R. S., & Tobias, J. D. (2002). Ketorolac for pain management after
 abdominal surgical procedures in infants. *Southern Medical Journal, 95*(3),
 331-333.
- Carney, D. E., Nicolette, L. A., Ratner, M. H., Minerd, A., & Baesl, T. J. (2001). Ketorolac reduces postoperative narcotic requirements. *Journal of Pediatric Surgery, 36*(1), 76-79.
- Camu, F., Van Overberge, L., Bullingham, R., & Lloyd, J. (1990). Hemodynamic effects of two intravenous doses of ketorolac tromethamine compared with morphine. *Pharmacotherapy*, *10*(6 (Pt 2)), 122S-126S.
- Cardwell, M., Siviter, G., & Smith, A. (2005). Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and perioperative bleeding in paediatric tonsillectomy [systematic review]. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, 4*
- Carney, D. E., Nicolette, L. A., Ratner, M. H., Minerd, A., & Baesl, T. J. (2001). Ketorolac reduces postoperative narcotic requirements. *Journal of Pediatric Surgery, 36*(1), 76-79.
- Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. (2006). Postoperative hemorrhage with nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug use after tonsillectomy: A meta-analysis (provisional record). *Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness, 1*

- Cepeda, M. S., Vargas, L., Ortegon, G., Sanchez, M. A., & Carr, D. B. (1995
 Jun). Comparative analgesic efficacy of patient-controlled analgesia with
 ketorolac versus morphine after elective intraabdominal operations.
 Anesthesia & Analgesia, 80(6), 1150-1153.
- Chauhan, R. D., Charles, B. I., & Noe, H. N. (2001). Safety of ketorolac in the pediatric population after ureteroneocystomy. *The Journal of Urology, 166*(1), 1873-1875.
- Chhabra, A. (2005). Anesthetic techniques and postoperative emesis in pediatric stabismus surgery. *Regional Anesthesia and Pain Medications, 30*(1), 43-47.
- Chiaretti, A., Simeone, E., Langer, A., Butera, G., Piastra, M., & Tortorolo, L., et al. (1997). Comparison of ketorolac and fentanyl for pain relief in pediatric intensive care. *Pediatria Medica e Chirurgica, 19*(6), 419-424.
- Dahl, J. L. (2002 Aug). Working with regulators to improve the standard of care in pain management: The U.S. experience. [review] [73 refs]. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management, 24*(2), 136-146.
- Dawson, K. H., Egbert, M. A., & Myall, R. W. (1996). Pain following iliac crest bone grafting of alveolar clefts. *Journal of Cranio-Maxillo-Facial Surgery : Official Publication of the European Association for Cranio-Maxillo-Facial Surgery, 24*(3), 151-154.
- DeAndrade, J. R., Maslanka, M., Reines, H. D., Howe, D., Rasmussen, G. L., & Cardea, J., et al. (1996). Ketorolac versus meperidine for pain relief after

orthopaedic surgery. *Clinical Orthopaedics & Related Research, 325*, 302-312.

- DeAndrade, J. R., Maslanka, M., Maneatis, T., Bynum, L., & Burchmore, M. (1994 Feb). The use of ketorolac in the management of postoperative pain. [review] [37 refs]. *Orthopedics, 17*(2), 157-166.
- Di Massa, A., Scardigli, M., Bruni, L., & Valentino, L. (2000 Oct). Ketorolac for paediatric postoperative pain. A review. [review] [81 refs]. *Minerva Anestesiologica, 66*(10), 749-756.
- Dsida, R. (2004). Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsilectomy: Do we have the data? *Anesthesiology, 100*(3), 749-751.
- Dsida, R. & Coté, C.J.(2004) Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsillectomy: do we have the data? *Anesthesiology*.
 2004, 100(3):749-750.
- Eberhard, F. M., & Mora, X. D. (2004). Pain management in the paedriatric patient. *Revista Chilena De Pediatria, 75*(3), 277-279.
- Eberson, C. P., Pacicca, D. M., & Ehrlich, M. G. (1999). The role of ketorolac in decreasing length of stay and narcotic complications in the postoperative pediatric orthopaedic patient. *Journal of Pediatric Orthopedics, 19*(5), 688-692.

Fitz-James, I., Ho, J., Pang, L. M., Seigfried, R., Mannino, S. F., & Sun, L. S. (1995). Effect of ketorolac on peri-operative bleeding and analgesia in pediatric tonsillectomy and appendectomy patients. *Anesth Analg, 80*, S127.

- Forrest, J. B., Heitlinger, E. L., & Revell, S. (1997 May). Ketorolac for postoperative pain management in children. [review] [113 refs]. *Drug Safety, 16*(5), 309-329.
- Fricke, J. R., Angelocci, D., Fox, K., MacHugh, D., & Yee, J. P. (1992).
 Comparision of the efficacy and safety of ketorolac and meperidine in the relief of dental pain. *J. Clin. Pharmacol.*, *32*, 376-384.
- Geisslinger, G., Peskar, B. A., Pallapies, D., Sittl, R., Levy, M., & Brune, K. (1996 Oct). The effects on platelet aggregation and prostanoid biosynthesis of two parenteral analgesics: Ketorolac tromethamine and dipyrone. *Thrombosis & Haemostasis, 76*(4), 592-597.
- Gillies, G. W., Kenny, G. N., Bullingham, R. E., & McArdle, C. S. (1987 Jul). The morphine sparing effect of ketorolac tromethamine. A study of a new, parenteral non-steroidal anti-inflammatory agent after abdominal surgery.
 Anaesthesia, 42(7), 727-731.
- Glassman, S. D., Rose, S. M., Dimar, J. R., Puno, R. M., Campbell, M. J., & Johnson, J. R. (1998 Apr 1). The effect of postoperative nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drug administration on spinal fusion. *Spine*, *23*(7), 834-838.

- Gora-Harper, M. L., Record, K. E., Darkow, T., & Tibbs, P. A. (2001). Opioid analgesics versus ketorolac in spine and joint procedures: Impact on healthcare resources. *Annals of Pharmacotherapy*, *35*(11), 1320-1326.
- Graham, S. G., & Wandless, J. G. (1995). The effect of ketorolac as an adjuvant to local anaesthetic infiltration for analgesia in paediatric umbilical hernia surgery. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*, 5(3), 161-163.
- Greco, C. (2005). Pain management for the hospitalized pediatric patient. *Pediatric Clinics of North America, 52*(4), 995-1027.
- Gunter, J. B., Varughese, A. M., Harrington, J. F., Wittkugel, E. P., Patankar, S.
 S., & Matar, M. M., et al. (1995). Recovery and complications after tonsillectomy in children: A comparison of ketorolac and morphine. *Anesthesia and Analgesia*, *81*(6), 1136-1141.
- Gupta, A., Daggett, C., Drant, S., Rivero, N., & Lewis; A. (2004). Prospective randomized trial of ketorolac after congenital heart surgery. *Journal of Cardiothoracic & Vascular Anesthesia, 18*(4), 454-457.
- Gupta, A., Daggett, C., Ludwick, J., Wells, W., & Lewis, A. (2005). Ketorolac after congenital heart surgery: Does it increase the risk of significant bleeding complications? *Paediatric Anaesthesia Paris*, *15*, 139-142
- Hackmann, T. (2004). Smaller dose of 0.5 mg/kg IV ketorolac is sufficient to provide pain relief in children. *Anesthesia Analogue, 98*(1), 275-276.

- Houck, C. S., Wilder, R. T., McDermott, J. S., Sethna, N. F., & Berde, C. B. (1996 Aug). Safety of intravenous ketorolac therapy in children and cost savings with a unit dosing system.[see comment]. *Journal of Pediatrics, 129*(2), 292-296.
- Jacob, E., & Puntillo, K. A. (2000 Jul). Variability of analgesic practices for hospitalized children on different pediatric specialty units. *Journal of Pain & Symptom Management, 20*(1), 59-67.
- Jadad, A. R., Moore, R. A., Carroll, D., Jenkinson, C., Reynolds, D. J., & Gavaghan, D. J., et al. (1996 Feb). Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: Is blinding necessary? *Controlled Clinical Trials, 17*(1), 1-12.
- Jelinek, G. A. (2000). Ketorolac versus morphine for severe pain. *British Medical Journal, 321*(Nov 18), 1236-1237.
- Judkins, J. H., Dray, T. G., & Hubbell, R. N. (1996 Sep). Intraoperative ketorolac and posttonsillectomy bleeding. *Archives of Otolaryngology -- Head & Neck Surgery, 122*(9), 937-940.
- Kain, Z. N., Caldwell-Andrews, A. A., Maranets, I., McClain, B., Gaal, D., &
 Mayes, L. C., et al. (2004 Dec). Preoperative anxiety and emergence
 delirium and postoperative maladaptive behaviors. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, *99*(6), 1648-1654.

- Keidan, I., Zaslansky, R., Eviatar, E., Segal, S., & Sarfaty, S. M. (2004).
 Intraoperative ketorolac is an effective substitute for fentanyl in children undergoing outpatient adenotonsillectomy. *Paediatric Anaesthesia*, *14*(4), 318-323.
- Kenny, G. N., McArdle, C. S., & Aitken, H. H. (1990). Parenteral ketorolac: Opiate-sparing effect and lack of cardiorespiratory depression in the perioperative patient. *Pharmacotherapy*, *10*(6 (Pt 2)), 127S-131S.
- Kinsella, J., Moffat, A. C., Patrick, J. A., Prentice, J. W., McArdle, C. S., & Kenny,
 G. N. (1992). Ketorolac trometamol for postoperative analgesia after
 orthopaedic surgery. *British Journal of Anaesthesia, 69*(1), 19-22.
- Kokki, H., & Salonen, A. (2002). Comparison of pre- and postoperative administration of ketoprofen for analgesia after tonsillectomy in children. *Paediatric Anaesthesia, 12*(2), 162-167.
- Kwon, J. Y., Kim, J. Y., Shin, S. W., & Kim, H. K. (1999). Effect of caudal bupivicaine, morphine and intravenous ketorolac for postoperative analgesia in outpatient inguinal operation. *Anesthesiology (Hagerstown), 91*(3A), A40.
- Lieh-Lai, M. W., Kauffman, R. E., Uy, H. G., Danjin, M., & Simpson, P. M. (1999).
 A randomized comparison of ketorolac tromethamine and morphine for postoperative analgesia in critically ill children. *Critical Care Medicine,* 27(12), 2786-2791.

- Mack, P. F., Hass, D., Lavyne, M. H., Snow, R. B., & Lien, C. A. (2001).
 Postoperative narcotic requirement after microscopic lumbar discectomy is not affected by intraoperative ketorolac or bupivacaine. *Spine, 26*(6), 658-661.
- Marret, E. (2004). In reply to nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and hemorrhage following tonsillectomy: Do we have the data? *Anesthesiology, 100*(3), 751-752.
- Marret, E., Antoine, F., Samama, C. M., & Bonnet, F. (2003). Effects of postoperative, nonsteroidal, antiinflammatory drugs on bleeding risk after tonsillectomy: Meta-analysis of randomized, controlled trials. *Anesthesiology, 98*, 1497-1502.
- Mason, H. H. (1993). Morphine sulfate, transdermal fentanyl citrate and ketorolac tromethamine: Effects on postoperative pulmonary function. *American Journal of Critical Care, 2*(1), 61-64.
- Mather, S. J., & Peutrell, J. M. (1995). Postoperative morphine requirements, nausea and vomiting following anaesthesia for tonsillectomy. comparison of intravenous morphine and non-opioid analgesic techniques. *Paediatric Anaesthesia, 5*(3), 185-188.
- Maunuksela, E. L., Kokki, H., & Bullingham, R. E. (1992). Comparison of intravenous ketorolac with morphine for postoperative pain in children. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 52*(Oct), 436-443.

- McCaffery, M., & Pasero, C. (1999). *Pain: Clinical manual* (2nd ed.). St. Louis, MO: Mosby.
- McCann, H. L., & Stanitski, D. F. (2004). Pediatric orthopaedic surgery pain management. *Journal of Pediatric Orthopedics, 24*(5), 581-586
- Mendel, H. G., Guarnieri, K. M., Sundt, L. M., & Torjman, M. C. (1995). The effects of ketorolac and fentanyl on postoperative vomiting and analgesic requirements in children undergoing strabismus surgery. *Anesthesia and Analgesia, 80*(6), 1129-1133.
- Moiniche, S., Romsing, J., Dahl, J. B., & Tramer, M. R. (2003). Nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and the risk of operative site bleeding after tonsillectomy: A quantitative systematic review. *Anesthesia Analogue, 96*, 68-77.
- Munro, H. M., Malviya, S., Lauder, G. R., Voepel-Lewis, T., & Tait, A. R. (1999). Pain relief in children following outpatient surgery. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia, 11*(3), 187-191.
- Munro, H. M., Riegger, L. Q., Reynolds, P. I., Wilton, N. C., & Lewis, I. H. (1994).
 Comparison of the analgesic and emetic properties of ketorolac and morphine for paediatric outpatient strabismus surgery. *British Journal of Anaesthesia, 72*(6), 624-628.
- Munro, H. M., Walton, S. R., Malviya, S., Merkel, S., Voepel-Lewis, T., & Loder, R. T., et al. (2002). Low-dose ketorolac improves analgesia and reduces

morphine requirements following posterior spinal fusion in adolescents. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia = Journal Canadien d'Anesthesie, 49*(5), 461-466.

- O'Hara, D. A., Fragen, R. J., Kinzer, M., & Pemberton, D. (1987 May). Ketorolac tromethamine as compared with morphine sulfate for treatment of postoperative pain. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 41*(5), 556-561.
- Olkkola, K. T., & Maunuksela, E. L. (1991 Feb). The pharmacokinetics of postoperative intravenous ketorolac tromethamine in children. *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 31*(2), 182-184.
- Pappas, A. L., Fluder, E. M., Creech, S., Hotaling, A., & Park, A. (2003).
 Postoperative analgesia in chldren undergoing myringotomy and placement equilization tubes in ambulatory surgery. *International Anesthesia Research Society*, *96*, 1621-1624.
- Park, J. M., Houck, C. S., Sethna, N. F., Sullivan, L. J., Atala, A., & Borer, J. G., et al. (2000). Ketorolac suppresses postoperative bladder spasms after pediatric ureteral reimplantation. *Anesthesia & Analgesia, 91*(1), 11-15.
- Pendeville, P. E., Van Boven, M. J., Contreras, V., Scholtes, J. L., Fosseur, G., & Lechien, P., et al. (1995). Ketorolac tromethamine for postoperative analgesia in oral surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Belgica*, *46*(1), 25-30.

- Perttunen, K., Nilsson, E., & Kalso, E. (1999). I.v. diclofenac and ketorolac for pain after thoracoscopic surgery. *British Journal of Anaesthesia, 82*(2), 221-227.
- Picard, P., Bazin, J. E., Conio, N., Ruiz, F., & Schoeffler, P. (1997 Dec).
 Ketorolac potentiates morphine in postoperative patient-controlled analgesia. *Pain, 73*(3), 401-406.
- Purday, J. P., Reichert, C. C., & Merrick, P. M. (1996). Comparative effects of three doses of intravenous ketorolac or morphine on emesis and analgesia for restorative dental surgery in children. *Canadian Journal of Anaesthesia = Journal Canadien d'Anesthesie, 43*(3), 221-225.
- Ready, L. B., Brown, C. R., Stahlgren, L. H., Egan, K. J., Ross, B., & Wild, L., et al. (1994 Jun). Evaluation of intravenous ketorolac administered by bolus or infusion for treatment of postoperative pain. A double-blind, placebocontrolled, multicenter study. *Anesthesiology*, *80*(6), 1277-1286.
- Reinhart, D. J., Latson, T. W., Whitten, C. W., Klein, K. W., Allison, P. M., &
 Patel, M. (1993 May-Jun). Influence of ketorolac tromethamine on clot elastic strength in humans as assessed by thromboelastography.[see comment]. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia, 5*(3), 216-220.
- Resman-Targoff, B. H. (1990 Nov). Ketorolac: A parenteral nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drug. [review] [51 refs]. *DICP, 24*(11), 1098-1104.

- Reuben, S. S., Connelly, N. R., Lurie, S., Klatt, M., & Gibson, C. S. (1998 Jul).
 Dose-response of ketorolac as an adjunct to patient-controlled analgesia
 morphine in patients after spinal fusion surgery.[see comment]. *Anesthesia & Analgesia, 87*(1), 98-102.
- Reuben, S. S., Connelly, N. R., & Steinberg, R. (1997 Jul-Aug). Ketorolac as an adjunct to patient-controlled morphine in postoperative spine surgery patients. *Regional Anesthesia*, *22*(4), 343-346.
- Richter, R. L., Valley, R. D., Bailey, A. G., Feid, E. B., & Calhoun, P. E. (1992). A comparision of intraoperative ketorolac, morphine and saline on opstoperative analgesia in the pediatric patient. *Anesthesiology*, *77*(3A), A1161.
- Romsing, J. (1998). Analgesic efficacy and safety of preoperative versus postoperative ketorolac in paediatric tonsillectomy. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica*, *42*(7), 770-775.
- Romsing, J., & Walther-Larsen, S. (1997 Jul). Peri-operative use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs in children: Analgesic efficacy and bleeding.[see comment]. [review] [40 refs]. *Anaesthesia*, *52*(7), 673-683.
- Rusy, L. M., Houck, C. S., Sullivan, L. J., Ohlms, L. A., Jones, D. T., & McGill, T. J., et al. (1995 Feb). A double-blind evaluation of ketorolac tromethamine versus acetaminophen in pediatric tonsillectomy: Analgesia and bleeding. *Anesthesia & Analgesia, 80*(2), 226-229.

Rutledge, D. N., Donaldson, N. E., & Pravikoff, D. S. (2002). Update: Pain assessment and documentation pediatrics part III. [Electronic version]. *The Online Journal of Clinical Innovations*, *5*, 1-45.

Schechter, N. L. (1999). Pain management. *Annales Nestle, 57*(1), 21-29.

- Shende, D. (1999). Comparative effects of intravenous ketorolac and pethidine on perioperative analgesia and postoperative nausea and vomiting (PONV) for paediatric strabismus surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica, 43*(3), 265-269.
- Soler Company, Faus Soler, M. T., Montaner Abasolo, M. C., & Morales Olivas, F. (2001). Study of analgesic drug use for the treatment of postsurgical pain. *Farmacia Hospitalaria, 25*(May-Jun), 150-155.
- Splinter, W. M., Reid, C. W., Roberts, D. J., & Bass, J. (1997). Reducing pain after inguinal hernia repair in children: Caudal anesthesia versus ketorolac tromethamine. *Anesthesiology*, 87(3), 542-546.
- Stanski, D. R., Cherry, C., Bradley, R., Sarnquist, F. H., & Yee, J. P. (1990).
 Efficacy and safety of single doses of intramuscular ketorolac tromethamine compared with meperidine for postoperative pain. *Pharmacotherapy, 10*(6 Part 2), 40S-44S.
- Stouten, E. M., Armbruster, S., Houmes, R. J., Prakash, O., Erdmann, W., & Lachmann, B. (1992 Oct). Comparison of ketorolac and morphine for

postoperative pain after major surgery. *Acta Anaesthesiologica Scandinavica, 36*(7), 716-721.

- Strom, B. L., Berlin, J. A., Kinman, J. L., Spitz, P. W., Hennessy, S., & Feldman,
 H., et al. (1996 Feb 7). Parenteral ketorolac and risk of gastrointestinal and
 operative site bleeding. A postmarketing surveillance study.[see comment]. *JAMA*, 275(5), 376-382.
- Sutters, K. A., Levine, J. D., Dibble, S., Savedra, M., & Miaskowski, C. (1995).
 Analgesic efficacy and safety of single-dose intramuscular ketorolac for postoperative pain management in children following tonsillectomy. *Pain*, *61*(1), 145-153.
- Sutters, K. A., Shaw, B. A., Gerardi, J. A., & Hebert, D. (1999). Comparison of morphine patient-controlled analgesia with and without ketorolac for postoperative analgesia in pediatric orthopedic surgery. *The American Journal of Orthopedics, 28*(6), 351-358.
- Thwaites, B. K., Nigus, D. B., Bouska, G. W., Mongan, P. D., Ayala, E. F., & Merrill, G. A. (1995 Jul). Intravenous ketorolac tromethamine does not worsen platelet function during knee arthroscopy under general anesthesia.[see comment]. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, *81*(1), 119-124.
- Varrassi, G., Panella, L., Piroli, A., Marinangeli, F., Varrassi, S., & Wolman, I., et al. (1994 Mar). The effects of perioperative ketorolac infusion on

postoperative pain and endocrine-metabolic response. *Anesthesia & Analgesia*, *78*(3), 514-519.

- Vetter, T. R., & Heiner, E. J. (1994). Intravenous ketorolac as an adjuvant to pediatric patient-controlled analgesia with morphine. *Journal of Clinical Anesthesia, 6*(2), 110-113.
- Vintar, N., Rawal, N., & Veselko, M. (2005). Intraarticular patient-controlled regional anesthesia after arthroscopically assisted anterior cruciate ligament reconstruction: Ropivacaine/morphine/ketorolac versus ropivacaine/morphine. *Anesthesia & Analgesia, 101*(2), 573-578.
- Watcha, M. F., Jones, M. B., Lagueruela, R. G., Schweiger, C., & White, P. F. (1992). Comparison of ketorolac and morphine as adjuvants during pediatric surgery. *Anesthesiology*, *76*(3), 368-372.
- Weinstein, M. S., Nicolson, S. C., & Schreiner, M. S. (1994). A single dose of morphine sulfate increases the incidence of vomiting after outpatient inguinal surgery in children. *Anesthesiology*, *81*(3), 572-577.

Table A-1. Summary of Meta-Analysis Findings Comparing Ketorolac versus Opioids

Pain Scores - First reported pain score * Self reported Pain Scales * Observational pain scales * Rescue Dosing - Requiring any post-operative dosing * Any post-operative rescue dosing * Tonsillectomy patients * Day Surgery vs. Inpatients * Time to Discharge - In minutes * Discharge from hospital * Time to Discharge of the Resource of the R		Statistically Significant	Not Statistically Significant
Self reported Pain Scales Self reported Pain Scales Rescue Dosing – Requiling any post-operative dosing Any post-operative rescue dosing Any post-operative rescue dosing Any post-operative rescue dosing X Tonsillectomy patients Nausea and Vomiting Any post-operative nausea Beleding Events Low dose ketorolac Beleding Events Any post-operative bleeding event Any post-oper	Pain Scores – First reported pain score		
Observational pain scales * Rescue Dosing – Requiring any post-operative dosing * Any post-operative rescue dosing * Tonsilicotomy patients * Bay Surgery vs. Inpatients * High dose ketorolae vs. Low dose ketorolac * IntraPre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing * Time to Discharge – In minutes * Discharge from recovery room or PARR * Discharge from nospital * Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients * Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients RR=0.43, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 Inpatients * High dose ketorolac * Inpatients * High dose ketorolac * High dose ketorolac * Inpatients * High dose ketorolac *	Self reported Pain Scales		×
Rescue Dosing - Requiring any post-operative dosing × Any post-operative rescue dosing × Day Surgery vs. Inpatients × High dose ketorolac vs. Low dose ketorolac × High dose ketorolac vs. Low dose ketorolac × Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing × Time to Discharge - In minutes × Discharge from recovery room or PARR × Discharge from hospital × Inpatients versus day surgery patients × Nausea and Vomiting - Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.53 Tonsillectorica × Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 × Inpatients RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bieeding event × High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events - Any reported post-operative	Observational pain scales	······	*
Any post-operative rescue dosing * Tonsillectomy patients * Day Surgery s. Inpatients * Day Surgery s. Inpatients * Day Surgery s. Inpatients * Time to Discharge - In minutes * Discharge from hospital * Discharge from hospital * Inpatients * Nausea and Vomiting - Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting * Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% C1 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients * Day surgery patients * Day surgery patients * Beding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event * High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% C1 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * High dose ketorolac * Bleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleedi	Posous Desing - Paquiring any post operative desing		
Any Disroperative rescue dosing - Tonsiliectomy patients × Day Surgery vs. Inpatients × High dose ketorolac vs. Low dose ketorolac × Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing × Time to Discharge - In minutes × Discharge from tecovery room or PARR × Discharge from hospital × Inpatients versus day surgery patients × Nausea and Vomiting - Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.73 Tonsillectomy patients × Day surgery patients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients × High dose ketorolac × Recoral × Bleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event × Any post-operative bl	Any post energing desing		
Torisitedomy patients - Day Surgery vs. Inpatients - High dose ketorolac vs. Low dose ketorolac * Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing * Time to Discharge from recovery room or PARR * Discharge from hospital * Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting - Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& Cl 0.51 to 0.78 Electing Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding even	Topoillostomy potiente		
Day Surgery vs. Inplatents * High dose ketorolac vs. Low dose ketorolac * Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing * Time to Discharge from recovery room or PARR * Discharge from necovery room or PARR * Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting * Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Strabismus repair patients RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients * Day surgery patients * High dose ketorolac RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 High dose ketorolac * Resco.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 * Day surgery patients * Inpatients R=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients R=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac * Strabismus repair patients * Strabismus repair patients *			~
High dose ketorolato vs. Low dose ketorolato * Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing * Time to Discharge from necovery room or PARR * Discharge from hospital * Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting * Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.48, 95% Cl 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any	Day Surgery vs. Inpatients		
Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing * Time to Discharge / In minutes * Discharge from neovery room or PARR * Discharge from hospital * Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients * Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 * Eleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event *	High dose ketorolac vs. Low dose ketorolac	······	*
Time to Discharge - In minutes Discharge from recovery room or PARR Discharge from hospital Inpatients versus day surgery patients Nausea and Vomiting - Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Parors Ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Day surgery patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.48, 95% Cl 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative drains WMD=-3.20, 95% Cl 5.49 to-0.91	Intra/Pre-operative dosing vs. Post-operative dosing		*
Discharge from recovery room or PARR × Discharge from hospital × Inpatients versus day surgery patients × Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting × Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients × Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients Favors Ketorolac High dose ketorolac RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac Strabismus repair patients × Any post-operative bleeding event × </td <td>Time to Discharge – In minutes</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Time to Discharge – In minutes		
Discharge from hospital * Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients Favors Ketorolac Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients Favors Ketorolac RB=0.48, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 * Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients RB=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RB=0.48, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bl	Discharge from recovery room or PARR		×
Inpatients versus day surgery patients Inpatients versus day surgery patients * Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients Favors Ketorolac Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac Millifiers of blood loss in post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding times *	Discharge from hospital		×
Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac Tonsillectomy patients RR=0.28, 95% Cl 0.51 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients * Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% Cl 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.63, 95& Cl 0.51 to 0.78 High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac RB=0.63, 95& Cl 0.51 to 0.78 * Low dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac Milleiters - Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains * Post-operative bleeding times WMD=-3.20, 95% Cl 5.49 to-0.91	Inpatients versus day surgery patients		*
Any post-operative nausea and vomiting Favors Ketorolac Any post-operative nausea and vomiting RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 * Day surgery patients * Day surgery patients * High dose ketorolac RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac Post-operative bleeding times *	Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative pausea and vomiting		
RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77 Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients × Day surgery patients × Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients × High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients × High dose ketorolac × Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event × Any post-operative bleeding event × Strabismus repair patients × Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains × Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains × Post-operative bleeding times ×	Any nost-onerative nausea and vomiting	Favors Ketorolac	
Strabismus repair patients Favors Ketorolac RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 * Day surgery patients * Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 * Inpatients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 High dose ketorolac RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac Bleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Tonsillectomy patients * Strabismus repair patients * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 *	The poor operative hadded and verning	RR=0.63, 95% CI 0.51 to 0.77	
RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53 Tonsillectomy patients Day surgery patients RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 Inpatients High dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative bleeding event Tonsillectomy patients Strabismus repair patients Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91	Strabismus repair patients	Favors Ketorolac	
Tonsillectomy patients × Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61 × Inpatients × High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 × Low dose ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Eleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event × Any post-operative bleeding event × Strabismus repair patients × Strabismus repair patients × Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac Post-operative bleeding times WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91		RR=0.28, 95% CI 0.15 to 0.53	
Day surgery patients Favors Ketorolac Inpatients # High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac Bleeding Events - Any reported post-operative bleeding event # Any post-operative bleeding event # Strabismus repair patients # Millilitiers of blood loss in post-operative drains # Post-operative bleeding times #	Tonsillectomy patients		×
Inpatients Inpatients High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac Image: state	Day surgery patients	Favors Ketorolac	
Inpatients × High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 * Low dose ketorolac × Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event × Any post-operative bleeding event × Tonsillectomy patients × Strabismus repair patients × Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 ×		RR=0.48, 95% CI 0.38 to 0.61	
High dose ketorolac Favors Ketorolac RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 X Low dose ketorolac X Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event X Any post-operative bleeding event X Tonsillectomy patients X Strabismus repair patients X Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 X	Inpatients		×
RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78 Low dose ketorolac × Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative bleeding event × Tonsillectomy patients × Strabismus repair patients × Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains × Post-operative bleeding times ×	High dose ketorolac	Favors Ketorolac	
Low dose ketorolac * Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event * Any post-operative bleeding event * Tonsillectomy patients * Strabismus repair patients * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 *	v	RR=0.63, 95& CI 0.51 to 0.78	
Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event × Any post-operative bleeding event × Tonsillectomy patients × Strabismus repair patients × Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 ×	Low dose ketorolac		*
Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event Any post-operative bleeding event Tonsillectomy patients Strabismus repair patients Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Post-operative bleeding times	Disading Events Annual and an article blooding avent		
Any post-operative bleeding event Tonsillectomy patients Strabismus repair patients Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Post-operative bleeding times	Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event		
Tonsillectomy patients * Strabismus repair patients * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 *	Any post-operative bleeding event		×
Strabismus repair patients * Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains Favors Ketorolac WMD=-3.20, 95% Cl 5.49 to-0.91 *	Tonsillectomy patients		*
Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains MMD=-3.20, 95% CI 5.49 to-0.91 Post-operative bleeding times	Strabismus repair patients		××
Post-operative bleeding times	Milliliters of blood loss in post-operative drains	Favors Ketorolac	
••	Post-onerative bleeding times	•••••0.20, 35/6 01 5.43 (0-0.31	*

Table A-1. Summary of Meta-Analysis Findings Comparing Ketorolac versus Opioids Cont.

Patients requiring re-admission/re-operation due to bleeding	×
Inpatients versus outpatients	×
High dose versus low dose ketorolac	×
Dose duration <24 hours versus >24 hours	*

Favors Opioids	
RR=1.92, 95% CI 1.15 to 3.20	
Favors Opioids	
RR=1.76, 95% CI 1.07 to 2.89	
	Favors Opioids RR=1.92, 95% Cl 1.15 to 3.20 Favors Opioids RR=1.76, 95% Cl 1.07 to 2.89

Table A-2. Summary of Meta-Analysis Findings Comparing Ketorolac versus Placebo

	Statistically Significant	Not Statistically Significant
Pain Scores – First reported pain score		
Poker Chip Scale	Favors Ketorolac	
·	WMD=-0.75, 95% CI -1.22 to -0.28	
Objective pain scales	Favors Ketorolac	
	WMD=-1.21, 95% CI -1.21 to -0.51	
Self reported bladder spasms	Favors Ketorolac	
	RR=0.30, 95% CI 0.11 to 0.83	
Rescue Dosing – Requiring any post-operative dosing		
Any post-operative rescue dosing		*
Micrograms of fentanyl required in recovery room	Favors Ketorolac	
	WMD=-27.26, 95% Cl -49.65 to -3.93	
Time to Dischause In minutes		
Time to Discharge – In minutes	Fourse Katorialaa	
Discharge from recovery room of PARR		*
Discharge from hospital	WWD=10.02, 95% CI-71.97 10-11.79	
Discharge from hospital		
Nausea and Vomiting – Any reported post-operative nausea and vomiting	W	18917-1
Any post-operative nausea and vomiting	199-100-100-100-100-100-100-100-100-100-	×
Strabismus repair patients		×
Tonsillectomy patients		×
Day surgery patients versus Inpatients	······································	*
High dose ketorolac vs low dose ketorolac	<u></u>	×
Bleeding Events – Any reported post-operative bleeding event		
Any post-operative bleeding event		×
Intra operative blood loss		x
Patients requiring ost-operative blood transfusion		x
Patients requiring re-admission/re-operation due to bleeding		x
Inpatients versus day surgery patients		xx
High dose versus low dose ketorolac		x
Dose duration <24 hours versus >24 hours		×

Table A-3. Characteristics of Excluded Studies

Study	Reason for exclusion
(Anthony & Jasinski, 2002)	Non-RCT
(Bailey, Sinha, & Burgess, 1997)	Adult IM injection
(Bean & Hunt, 1992)	IM injection
(Bean-Lijewski & Hunt, 1996)	IM injection
(Bravo, Mattie, Spierdijk, Bovill, & Burm, 1988)	IM injection
(Brown, Moodie, Wild, & Bynum, 1990)	Adult
(Burd & Tobias, 2002)	Non RCT
(Camu, Van Overberge, Bullingham, & Lloyd, 1990)	Adult patients
(Cardwell, Siviter, & Smith, 2005)	Systematic review
(Carney, Nicolette, Ratner, Minerd, & Baesl, 2001)	Non-RCT
(Cepeda, Vargas, Ortegon, Sanchez, & Carr, 1995 Jun)	Adult
(Chauhan, Charles, & Noe, 2001)	Non RCT
(Chhabra, 2005)	IM administration
(Centre for Reviews and Dissemination, 2006)	Systematic review
(Dawson, Egbert, & Myall, 1996)	Unable to contact
(J. R. DeAndrade, Maslanka, Maneatis, Bynum, & Burchmore, 1994 Feb)	Review
(J. R. DeAndrade et al., 1996)	IM administration
(Dsida, 2004)	Editorial
(Eberhard & Mora, 2004)	Non-RCT
(Eberson, Pacicca, & Ehrlich, 1999)	Non-RCT
(Fitz-James et al., 1995)	IM route
(Forrest, Heitlinger, & Revell, 1997 May)	Review
(Fricke, Angelocci, Fox, MacHugh, & Yee, 1992)	IM injection
(Geisslinger et al., 1996 Oct)	Adult
(Gillies, Kenny, Bullingham, & McArdle, 1987 Jul)	Adult
(Glassman et al., 1998 Apr 1)	Adult IM
(Gora-Harper, Record, Darkow, & Tibbs, 2001)	Non RCT Adult
(Graham & Wandless, 1995)	No IV opioid (Wound infiltration with 0.5% bupivicaine)
(Greco, 2005)	Non RCT
(Gupta, Daggett, Drant, Rivero, & Lewis, 2004)	Non RCT
(Hackmann, 2004)	Comment/Letter
(Houck, Wilder, McDermott, Sethna, & Berde, 1996 Aug)	Chart review

Table A-3. Characteristics of Excluded Studies Cont.

(Jelinek, 2000)	Editorial
(Kenny, McArdle, & Aitken, 1990)	Adult
(Kinsella et al., 1992)	IM administration
(Kokki & Salonen, 2002)	No toradol comparison
(Kwon, Kim, Shin, & Kim, 1999)	Unable to contact for more information
(Mack, Hass, Lavyne, Snow, & Lien, 2001)	Adult
(Marret, Antoine, Samama, & Bonnet, 2003)	Systematic review
(Mason, 1993)	Non RCT
(Mather & Peutrell, 1995)	No ketorolac comparison
(McCann & Stanitski, 2004)	Non RCT
(Moiniche, Romsing, Dahl, & Tramer, 2003)	Systematic review
Moyao-Garc, 2004	Non-RCT
(Munro, Malviya, Lauder, Voepel-Lewis, & Tait, 1999)	Chart review
(O'Hara, Fragen, Kinzer, & Pemberton, 1987 May)	Adult IM injection
(Olkkola & Maunuksela, 1991 Feb)	No comparison to placebo or opioid
(Pappas, Fluder, Creech, Hotaling, & Park, 2003)	No IV ketorolac
(Pendeville et al., 1995)	Request for information returned. Unable to obtain data on pediatric patients
(Perttunen, Nilsson, & Kalso, 1999)	Adult
(Picard, Bazin, Conio, Ruiz, & Schoeffler, 1997 Dec)	Adult
(Ready et al., 1994 Jun)	Adult Review
(Reinhart et al., 1993 May-Jun)	IM adult
(Reuben, Connelly, & Steinberg, 1997 Jul-Aug)	Adult
(Reuben, Connelly, Lurie, Klatt, & Gibson, 1998 Jul)	Adult
(Richter, Valley, Bailey, Feid, & Calhoun, 1992)	IM injection
(Romsing & Walther-Larsen, 1997 Jul)	Review
(Schechter, 1999)	Non-RCT
(Soler Company, Faus Soler, Montaner Abasolo, & Morales Olivas, 2001)	Non-RCT
(Splinter, Reid, Roberts, & Bass, 1997)	
(Stanski, Cherry, Bradley, Sarnquist, & Yee, 1990)	IM administration route
(Stouten et al., 1992 Oct)	Adult
(Strom et al., 1996 Feb 7)	Non-RCT
(Sutters, Levine, Dibble, Savedra, & Miaskowski, 1995)	IM administration
(Thwaites et al., 1995 Jul)	Adults
(Varrassi et al., 1994 Mar)	Adult/Review

Table A-3. Characteristics of Excluded Studies Cont

(Vetter & Heiner, 1994)	No comparison
(Vintar, Rawal, & Veselko, 2005)	Adults
(Watcha, Jones, Lagueruela, Schweiger, & White, 1992)	Editorial
(Weinstein, Nicolson, & Schreiner, 1994)	No comparison for ketorolac

Study	Methods	Participants	Interventions	Outcomes	Notes	Allocation concealment
Chiaretti,1997	Prospective randomized controlled trial	 52 patients Age: 66.6 ± 70.5 mo* Inpatients 	 A) Ketorolac 1.2 mg/kg q6h B) Ketorolac 1.2 mg/kg (bolus) + 0.21 mg/kg/hr C) Fentanyl 1 mcg/kg/hr D) Fentanyl 1 mcg/kg/hr + Ketorolac 0.21 mg/kg/hr 	Best pain control in Ketorolac and Fentanyl group	Jadad score: 2	В
Gunter, 1995	 Double blind, Prospective, randomized controlled trial 	 97 patients Age: 71.5 ± 30.5 mo Tonsillectomy Day surgery 	Ketorolac 1mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg	 No decrease in awakening time, time to readiness for discharge, or readmission between both groups. Patients receiving morphine were more likely to experience emesis after leaving the RR than the ketorolac group 	Jadad score: 4 • Study stopped after first 96patients due to bleeding concerns.	A

Table A-4. Characteristics of Included Studies

* Unless otherwise noted, age is presented in pooled mean ± standard deviation

Gupta et al, 2005	Prospective, randomized controlled trial	 72 patients Age: 24.1 ± 33.8 mo Surgery for congenital heart disease 	 Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg Q6h ATC No ketorolac 	 Short term use of ketorolac (<48 hrs) is not associate with and increase in bleeding complications 	Jadad score:2	В
Keidan et al, 2004	 Double blind Prospective, randomized controlled trial 	 57 patients Age: 4.95 ± 2.6 yr Surgery: adenoidectomy and laser- assisted tonsillectomy 	 Ketorolac 1 mg/kg Fentanyl 2 μg/kg 	 There was no statistical difference between Fentanyl and Ketorolac in N&V, or pain scores. The ketorolac group had higher agitation scores in recovery. 	Jadad score: 3	В
Lieh-Lai, 1999	 Prospective, Randomized, Double-blind Parallel Single-dose Positive control study 	 102 patients Age: 10.4 ± 4.4 years Admitted to the intensive care unit postoperatively 	 Ketorolac 0.6 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg 	 No difference between group concerning pain control, rescue dose requirements, bleeding time or vital signs. More patients in the ketorolac experienced N&V than the morphine group. More patients in the morphine group never achieved pain relief than in the ketorolac group. 	Jadad score: 3	В

Table A-4.	Characteristics	of Included	Studies Cont.
procession of the second se	where the second s	forbered and observe and a second	a anna a canada a canada an

^{\$} Age presented in median (range)

Maunuksela, 1992	 Double blind Randomized parallel-group study 	 92 patients, Age: 7 (3-12) yr^{\$} Elective surgery and understand the pain scoring scale 	 Morphine 0.1mg/kg Ketorolac 0.2 mg/kg + 0.2 mg/kg, + 0.1 mg/kg Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg followed by 2 doses of placebo 	 No statistically significant difference in pain scores Less doses of morphine were required to achieved pain control than of ketorolac. Patients in morphine group achieved pain control quicker, but ketorolac group sustained pain relief longer. Sedation ↓ ketorolac group. 	Jadad score: 3	В
Mendel et al, 1995	Randomized controlled trial	 54 patients; Age: 4.2 ± 2.13 yr Outpatient strabismus surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.9 mg/kg Fentanyl 1 microgram/kg, Saline placebo diluted to a total volume of 2 mls 	 Patients in the placebo and ketorolac group had a significantly lower rate of emesis compared with the fentanyl group. Post-operative pain scores and the need for rescue medication did not differ among the groups. No bleeding complications were noted. 	Jadad score: 1	В
Munro et al, 1994	 Double-blind Prospective, randomized study 	 42 patients, Age: 5.2 (2-9)⁺ yr Outpatient strabismus surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.75 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg and metoclopramide 0.15 mg/kg IV 	 No difference in pain behavior scores or recovery times. Significant increase in nausea and vomiting in the morphine group. 	Jadad score: 2	В
Munro et al, 2002	Prospective, randomized double-blind placebo- controlled study	 35 patients, Age: 14 ± 1.25 yr Posterior spinal fusion surgery 	Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg or Normal Saline 5 ml	 No difference in post- operative blood loss or transfusion requirements, puritis, N&V or constipation. Ketorolac group tolerated movement on POD one. 	Jadad score: 3	В

Table A-4. Characteristics of Included Studies Cont.

⁺ Age presented in mode (range)

Park et al, 2000	Double-blind randomized study	 24 patients, Age: 5.95 (4-11.5) yr^{&} Ureteral reimplantation surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.5 mg/kg Normal Saline to equal volume 	• Ketorolac is effective in reducing the frequency and severity of postoperative bladder spasms.	Jadad score: 3	В
Purday et al, 1996	Randomized, double-blind, prospective study	 120 patients Age: 4 (2-10)yr^{\$} Dental restorative surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.75 mg/kg Ketorolac 1.0 mg/kg Ketorolac 1.5 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg IV 	 No differences detected in the OPS at 15 or 30 mins between morphine and ketorolac groups. No difference in post-operative bleeding or rescue medication needs. Post-operative vomiting was more frequent in the morphine group than any of the ketorolac groups 	Jadad Score: 2	Β
Romsing, 1998	Randomized, double-blind, placebo- controlled study	 60 patients, Age: 9.3 ± 3.4 yr Tonsillectomy 	 Ketorolac 1 mg/kg Placebo 	 Pain scores, vomiting and acetaminophen dosing were significantly lower in ketorolac group. No difference in pain scores or post-operative hemorrhage. 	Jadad Score:3	В
Shende, 1999	Randomized, double- blind study	 52 patients Age: 7±3.6 yr Strabismus surgery 	 Ketorolac 0.9 mg/kg Pethidine 0.5 mg/kg 	 Recovery scores, pain scores and post operative analgesic requirements were similar in both groups. N&V occurred more often in pethidine than ketorolac group 	Jadad Score: 1	В

Table A-4. Characteristics of Included Studies Cont.

[&] Age presented in mean (range) ^{\$} Age presented in median (range)

Sutters et al, 1999	Prospective, randomized double blind, placebo controlled study	 68 patients, Age; Avg 12.6 yr Orthopedic surgery 	 Ketorolac 1 mg/kg loading dose with 0.5 mg/kg q6h Placebo 	 Increased pain control and decreased opioid need with ketorolac 	Jadad Score: 3	A
Watcha, 1992	Randomized, double-blind placebo controlled study	 95 patients Age: 8.9 ± 3.7 yr 	 Ketorolac 0.9 mg/kg Morphine 0.1 mg/kg Normal saline 	 No statistically significant difference in pain scores when comparing morphine and ketorolac. Placebo group had significantly higher pain scores and more frequent rescue dosing. Ketorolac group had less emesis than morphine group. 	Jadad Score: 3	В

Table A-4. Characteristics of Included Studies Cont.

Figure A-4.

Objective Pain Scale - Ketorolac vs. Opioids- First Reported Pain Scores

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review Comparison: 01 Self Reported Pain Scales - Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 01 First Reported Pain Score - OPS

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioid Mean (SD)	WMD (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	VVMD (random) 95% Cl
01 All surgeries							·
Watcha, 1992	32	1.00(2.25)	31	2.00(2.25)		24.11	-1.00 [-2.11, 0.11]
Mendel et al, 1995	18	2.70(1.70)	18	3.20(3.00)		19.00	-0.50 [-2.09, 1.09]
Purday et al, 1996	90	1.67(2.04)	30	0.00(1.75)		27.96	1.67 [0.92, 2.42]
Shende, 1999	26	2.00(1.27)	26	1.96(1.14)	<u></u>	28.93	0.04 [-0.62. 0.70]
Subtotal (95% CI)	166		105		-	100.00	0.13 [-1.07. 1.32]
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	19.35, df = 3 (l	P = 0.0002), I ² = 84.5%			T		
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.	21 (P = 0.84)						
02 Day Surgery Patients							
Mendel et al, 1995	18	2.70(1.70)	18	3.20(3.00)	<u> </u>	25.03	-0.50 [-2.09, 1.09]
Purday et al, 1996	90	1.67(2.04)	30	0.00(1.75)	- 300-	36.85	1.67 [0.92, 2.42]
Shende, 1999	26	2.00(1.27)	26	1.96(1.14)		38.12	0.04 [-0.62, 0.70]
Subtotal (95% CI)	134		74			100.00	0.50 [-0.80, 1.80]
est for heterogeneity. Chi ² =	12.33, df = 2 (1	P = 0.002), I ² = 83.8%			-		
Fest for overall effect: Z = 0.	75 (P = 0.45)						
03 Inpatients							
Watcha, 1992	32	1.00(2.25)	31	2.00(2.25)	100005	100.00	-1.00 [-2.11 , 0.11]
Subtotal (95% CI)	32		31			100.00	-1.00 [-2.11. 0.11]
lest for heterogeneity: not as	plicable				-		
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1$, 76 (P = 0.08)						

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioid

Figure A-5.

Self Reported Pain Scales - Ketorolac vs. Opioids

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:03 Observational Pain Scales - Ketorolac vs OpioidsOutcome:01 Oucher Scale

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	OR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	OR (random) 95% Cl
01 Acheived Pain Relief					
Lieh-Lai, 1999	31/54	21/48		0.00	1.73 [0.79, 3.80]
Subtotal (95% CI)	54	48		0.00	1.73 [0.79, 3.80]
Total events: 31 (Ketorolac), 21 (Placeb Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.37$ (P = 0.1	o) 7)				
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 31 (Ketorolac), 21 (Placeb Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 1.37 (P = 0.1	54 o) 7)	48		0.00	1.73 [0.79, 3.80]
	<u> </u>	<u></u>	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5	10	
			Favours Ketorolac — Favours Opio	ida	

Figure A-6.

Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Patients Requiring Post-Operative PRN Medications

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 04 Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 01 Patients requiring post-operative PRN medications for pain

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (ra∩dom) 95% Cl
01 All surgeries					
Maunuksela, 1992	42/61	22/31	+	30.35	0.97 [0.73, 1.29]
Munro et al, 1994	3/21	5/21	_	2.02	0.60 [0.16, 2.20]
Gunter, 1995	21/49	13/47	↓	9.81	1.55 [0.88, 2.72]
Mendel et al, 1995	13/18	12/18	-#-	15.49	1.08 [0.70, 1.67]
Purday et al, 1996	51/90	9/30	 =	9.46	1.89 [1.06, 3.36]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	31/54	30/48	-+-	25.52	0.92 [0.67, 1.26]
Shende, 1999	10/26	11/26		7.33	0.91 [0.47, 1.76]
Subtotal (95% CI)	319	221		100.00	1.08 [0.88, 1.33]
Total events: 171 (Ketorolac), Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.7	102 (Opioids) 8.22, df = 6 (P = 0.22), l² = 27 4 (P = 0.46)	7.0%			
02 Tonsillectomies with/without	ut ade⊓oidectomy				
Gunter, 1995	21/49	13/47		50.39	1.55 [0.88, 2.72]
Keidan et al, 2004	10/25	18/32		49.61	0.71 [0.40, 1.26]
Subtotal (95% CI)	74	79	-	100.00	1.05 [0.49, 2.26]
Total events: 31 (Ketorolac), 3	81 (Opioids)		ſ		
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ^z = Test for overall effect: Z = 0.1	3.66, df = 1 (P = 0.06), i² = 72 3 (P = 0.90)	2.7%			
03 Strabismus Repair					
Munro et al, 1994	3/21	5/21		8.13	0.60 [0.16, 2.20]
Mendel et al, 1995	13/18	12/18	-#=-	62.36	1.08 [0.70, 1.67]
Shende, 1999	10/26	11/26	#	29.52	0.91 [0.47, 1.76]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	65	65	◆	100.00	0.99 [0.70, 1.40]
Total events: 26 (Ketorolac), 2	8 (Opioids)		ſ		·
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 =$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.0$	0.92, df = 2 (P = 0.63), l ² = 09 7 (P = 0.95)	%			
		0.0*	1 0.1 1 10	100	

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure A-7.

Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Opioids -Inpatients vs. Day Surgery Patients

Review:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review
Comparison:	04 Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 02 Inpatients vs Day surgery patients

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 Inpatients		·····			
Maunuksela, 1992	42/61	22/31	-#-	53.08	0.97 [0.73, 1.29]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	31/54	30/48		46.92	0.92 [0.67, 1.26]
Subtotal (95% CI)	115	79	+	100.00	0.95 [0.77, 1.17]
Total events: 73 (Ketorolac), 5	2 (Opioids)		1		
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 = (0.07, df = 1 (P = 0.80), l ² = 09	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5	1 (P = 0.61)				
02 Day Surgery Patients					
Munro et al, 1994	3/21	5/21		4.21	0.60 [0.16, 2.20]
Gunter, 1995	21/49	13/47		18.43	1.55 [0.88, 2.72]
Mendel et al, 1995	13/18	12/18		27.12	1.08 [0.70, 1.67]
Purday et al, 1996	51/90	9/30		17.85	1.89 [1.06, 3.36]
Shende, 1999	10/26	11/26		14.22	0.91 [0.47, 1.76]
Keidan et al, 2004	10/25	18/32	—— — —————————————————————————————————	18.18	0.71 [0.40, 1.26]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	229	174		100.00	1.12 [0.81, 1.54]
Total events: 108 (Ketorolac), i	68 (Opioids)		-		
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 8	3.29, df = 5 (P = 0.14), l ² = 39	1.7%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.68	B (P = 0.50)				
		0.1	0.2 0.5 1 2	5 10	
		i	Favours Ketorolac 🛛 Favours Opi	oids	

Figure A-8.

Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - High Dose Ketorolac vs. Low Dose Ketorolac

Review: The Role of Comparison: 04 Rescue I Outcome: 03 High dose	Intravenous Ketorolac in the P Dosing - Ketorolac vs Opioids e vs Low dose Ketorolac	ain Control of Post-Operati	ve Pediatric Patients: A System	natic Review	
Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (fixed) 95% Cl
01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.6	6 mg/kg/dose)				
Munro et al, 1994	3/21	5/21		4.89	0.60 [0.16, 2.20]
Gunter, 1995	21/49	13/47	- 	- 12.97	1.55 [0.88, 2.72]
Mendel et al, 1995	13/18	12/18	_	11.73	1.08 [0.70, 1.67]
Purday et al, 1996	51/90	9/30		- 13.19	1.89 [1.06, 3.36]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	31/54	30/48		31.04	0.92 [0.67, 1.26]
Shende, 1999	10/26	11/26		10.75	0.91 [0.47, 1.76]
Keidan et al, 2004	10/25	18/32		15.43	0.71 [0.40, 1.26]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	283	222		100.00	1.10 [0.90, 1.34]
Total events: 139 (Ketorolac),	,98 (Opioids)		+		• • -
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	9.46, df = 6 (P = 0.15), l ² = 36	.5%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.9	93 (P = 0.35)				
02 Low dose Ketorolac (<=0.:	5 mg/kg/dose)				
Maunuksela, 1992	42/61	22/31	-	100.00	0.97 [0.73, 1.29]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	61	31		100.00	0.97 [0.73, 1.29]
Total events: 42 (Ketorolac), 2	22 (Opioids)		T		• -
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.2	21 (P = 0.83)				
			D.1 0.2 0.5 1 2	5 10	
			Favours Ketorolac Favou	rs Opioids	

Figure A-9.

Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Pre/Intra-Operative Dosing vs. Post-Operative Dosing

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac	Opioids	RR (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (fixed) 95% Cl
, ous outogot ;				~~~~~~	
)1 Intra/Pre-operative Dosing			:		
Munro et al, 1994	3/21	5/21		8.73	0.60 {0.16, 2.20]
Mendel et al, 1995	13/18	12/18		20.95	1.08 [0.70, 1.67]
Purday et al, 1996	51/90	9/30	·	23.56	1.89 [1.06, 3.36]
Shende, 1999	10/26	11/26	····-	19.20	0.91 [0.47, 1.76]
Keidan et al, 2004	10/25	18/32	B	27.56	0.71 (0.40, 1.26)
Subtotal (95% Cl)	180	127		100.00	1.09 [0.83, 1.44]
fotal events: 87 (Ketorolac), 55	(Opioids)				
fest for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 6	.79, df = 4 (P = 0.15), l ² = 41	.1%			
fest for overall effect: Z = 0.64	(P = 0.52)				
)2 Post-Operative Dosing					
Maunuksela, 1992	42/61	22/31	-#-	39.31	0.97 [0.73, 1.29]
Gunter, 1995	21/49	13/47		17.88	1.55 [0.88, 2.72]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	31/54	30/48		42.80	0.92 [0.67, 1.26]
Subtotal (95% CI)	164	126	÷	100.00	1.05 [0.86, 1.29]
fotal events: 94 (Ketorolac), 65	(Opioids)		T T		
est for beterogeneity: Chi2 - 2	.83. df = 2 (P = 0.24), l ² = 29	.2%			
ear for herefogeneiry, on a - z					

Figure A-10.

Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids -Discharge from Recovery Room or PARR

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 06 Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs Opioids Outcome: 01 Discharge from Recovery Room or PARR (mins)

Outcome:	UT Discharge from Recovery Room of PARR (mins)

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)		WMD (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	VMD (fixed) 95% Cl
01 All surgeries								
Watcha, 1992	32	35.80(10.70)	31	39.70(19.40)			37.90	-3.90 [-11.67, 3.87]
Gunter, 1995	49	71.00(31.00)	47	69.00(33.00)			13.93	2.00 [-10.82, 14.82]
Purday et al, 1996	90	46.33(13.94)	30	47.00(17.50)			- 48.17	-0.67 [-7.56, 6.22]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	171		108				100.00	-1.52 [-6.31, 3.26]
Test for heterogeneity: Chi^2 Test for overall effect: $Z = I$	[:] = 0.71 , df = 2 (F 0.62 (P = 0.53)	9 = 0.70), i² = 0%						
02 Tonsillecotmy with/witho	out adenoidector	ıγ						
Gunter, 1995	49	71.00(31.00)	47	69.00(33.00)			→ 100.00	2.00 [-10.82, 14.82]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	49		47				100.00	2.00 [-10.82, 14.82]
Test for heterogeneity: not	applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = I	0.31 (P = 0.76)							
1					-10	-5 0	5 10	
					Favours	Ketorolac Favours	Opioids	

Figure A-11.

Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Discharge from Hospital

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 06 Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 02 Discharge from Hospital (mins)

Of All surgeries Murno et al, 1994 21 107.00(23.00) 21 116.00(28.00) Murno et al, 1995 49 226.00(109.00) 17 229.00(70.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00(48.00) 18 134.00(38.00) Purday et al, 1996 90 76.67(23.37) 3 75.00(13.00) Outrat et al, 2005 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) Subtotal (35% C) 213 124 Test for heterogeneity. Ch ⁺ = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Outrat, 1995 49 226.00 (109.00) 47 229.00 (70.00) Statiotal (35% C) 49 226.00 (109.00) 47 229.00 (70.00) Outrat, 1995 49 226.00 (109.00) 47 229.00 (70.00) Statistical (35% C) 49 226.00 (109.00) 47 229.00 (70.00) Statistical (35% C) 49 226.00 (109.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Statistical (35% C) 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Statistical (35% C) 35 720.00 (17280.00)	Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)		WMD (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	WMD (random) 95% Cl
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	01 All surgeries	 .			· · · · ·				- Auto
$ \begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Munro et al, 1994	21	107.00(23.00)	21	116.00(28.00)			37.84	-9.00 [-24.50, 6.50]
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Gunter, 1995	49	226.00(109.00)	47	229.00(70.00)	-		9.41	-3.00 [-39.50, 33.50]
Purday et al, 1996 90 76.67(23.37) 3 75.00(13.00) Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) Jest for heterogenety; Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% 124 100.00 -3.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogenety; Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% 100.00 49 47 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Qurder, 1995 49 226.00(109.00) 47 229.00(70.00) 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Subtotal (95% Cl) 49 226.00(109.00) 47 229.00(70.00) 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) 100.00 -3.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] <td>Mendel et al, 1995</td> <td>18</td> <td>160.00(48.00)</td> <td>18</td> <td>134.00(38.00)</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td>14.85</td> <td>26.00 [-2.28, 54.28]</td>	Mendel et al, 1995	18	160.00(48.00)	18	134.00(38.00)			14.85	26.00 [-2.28, 54.28]
Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) Subtotal (35% C) 213 124 0.00 1440.00 1-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogeneity. Chi ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% 124 0.81 [-10.89, 12.51] Test for heterogeneity. Chi ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] 102.00 49 226.00(109.00) 47 229.00(70.00) 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] 100.00 49 47 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Subtotal (35% Cl) 49 220.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) 100.00 -3.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (35% Cl) 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (35% Cl) 35 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (35% Cl) 35 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (35% Cl) 35 35 35	Purday et al, 1996	90	76.67(23.37)	3	75.00(13.00)			37.89	1.67 [-13.81, 17.15]
Subtotal (95% CI) 213 124 100.00 0.81 [-10.89, 12.51] Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1% Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Murro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Subtotal (95% CI) 39 Subtotal (95% CI) 39 Subtotal (95% CI) 39 Subtotal (95% CI) 39 Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), P = 77.9%	Gupta et al, 2005	35	7200.00(17280.00)	35	5760.00(6840.00)	←		0.00	1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94]
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.82$, $df = 4 (P = 0.31)$, $P = 17.1\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.14 (P = 0.89)$ 02 Tonsillectomy with/without adenoidectomy Gunter, 1995 49 226.00(109.00) 47 229.00(70.00) 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] 100.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.16 (P = 0.87)$ 03 Cardiac surgery Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) Subtotal (95% CI) 35 18 160.00(48.00) 18 134.00(38.00) Mendel et al, 1994 21 107.00(23.00) 21 116.00(28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00(48.00) 18 134.00(38.00) Subtotal (95% CI) 39 29 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47] Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 4.52$, $di = 1 (P = 0.03)$, $P = 77.9\%$	Subtotal (95% CI)	213		124			-	100.00	0.81 [-10.89, 12.51]
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.14$ (P = 0.89) 02 Tonsillectomy with/without adenoidectomy Gunder, 1995 49 226.00 (109.00) 47 229.00 (70.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 49 47 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.16$ (P = 0.87) 03 Cardiac surgery Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) 04 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (140.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (140.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), I ² = 77.9%	Test for heterogeneity: Chi ²	= 4.82, df = 4 (P = 0.31), P = 17.1%				T		. , .
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Test for overall effect: Z = 0	1.14 (P = 0.89)							
Gunter, 1995 49 226.00(109.00) 47 229.00(70.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 49 47 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] O3 Cardiac surgery 00.00 -3.00 [-39.50, 33.50] O3 Cardiac surgery 00.00 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 5760.00(6840.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 7200.00(17280.00) 35 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Vest for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Vest for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Vest for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 [-24.50, 6.50] 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Vest for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 [-24.50, 6.50] 1440.00 [-24.50, 6.50] Vest for heterogeneity: Chi² = 4	02 Tonsillectomy with/without	ut adenoidecto	mγ						
Subtotal (95% Cl) 49 47 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.16 (P = 0.87)$ 03 Cardiac surgery Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65)$ 04 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39 Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 Test for heterogeneity: Ch ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), l ² = 77.9%	Gunter, 1995	49	226.00(109.00)	47	229.00(70.00)	-		100.00	-3.00 (-39.50, 33.50)
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.16 (P = 0.87)$ 03 Cardiac surgery Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65)$ 04 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39 39 Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47] Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), l ² = 77.9%	Subtotal (95% CI)	49		47		-		100.00	-3.00 [-39.50, 33.50]
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.16 (P = 0.87)$ O3 Cardiac surgery Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 35 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65)$ Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 100.00 (-2.28, 54.28] Subtotal (95% Cl) 30 (-2.28, 54.28] Subtota	Test for heterogeneity: not a	applicable							
03 Cardiac surgery 03 Cardiac surgery Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65) 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] O4 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) 28.18 26.00 [-2.28, 54.28] Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47] Test for heterogeneity: Ch² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), l² = 77.9% 39 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47]	Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.16 (P = 0.87)							
Gupta et al, 2005 35 7200.00 (17280.00) 35 5760.00 (6840.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65) 04 Stribismus Repair 100.00 1440.00 [-24.50, 6.50] Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) 28.18 26.00 [-2.28, 54.28] Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39 39 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47] Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), i ² = 77.9% 39 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47]	03 Cardiac surgery								
Subtotal (95% Cl) 35 35 Test for heterogeneity: not applicable 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65) 04 Stribismus Repair 100.00 1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94] Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) -9.00 [-24.50, 6.50] Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00)	Gupta et al, 2005	35	7200.00(17280.00)	35	5760.00(6840.00)	▲		→ 100.00	1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94]
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65) 04 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47] Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), i ² = 77.9% 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47]	Subtotal (95% CI)	35		35				100.00	1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94]
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.46 (P = 0.65) 04 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Image: Comparison of the	Test for heterogeneity: not a	pplicable							. , .
04 Stribismus Repair Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) Image: constraint of the string of the	Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.46 (P = 0.65)							
Munro et al, 1994 21 107.00 (23.00) 21 116.00 (28.00) 71.82 -9.00 [-24.50, 6.50] Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) 28.18 26.00 [-2.28, 54.28] Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47] Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), l ² = 77.9% - - -	04 Stribismus Repair								
Mendel et al, 1995 18 160.00 (48.00) 18 134.00 (38.00) Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 28.18 26.00 [-2.28, 54.28] Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), l ² = 77.9% 39 100.00 6.42 [-27.64, 40.47]	Munro et al. 1994	21	107,00(23,00)	21	116,00(28,00)			71.82	-9.00 [-24.50. 6.50]
Subtotal (95% Cl) 39 39	Mendel et al. 1995	18	160.00(48.00)	18	134.00(38.00)			28.18	26.00 [-2.28. 54.28]
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 4.52, df = 1 (P = 0.03), l ² = 77.9%	Subtotal (95% CI)	39		39			-	100.00	6.42 [-27 64 40 47]
	Test for heterogeneity: Chi2	= 4.52. df = 1 (P = 0.03), I ² = 77.9%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.37 (P = 0.71)	Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.37 (P = 0.71)							
	·					-100 -50	0 50	100	
Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids						Fayours Ket	orolac Fayours Op	ioids	

Figure A-12.

Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Inpatients vs. Day Surgery Patients

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 06 Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs Opioids

 Outcome:
 03 Daysurgery patients vs Inpatients

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)		VVMD (f 95%	ixed) Cl	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl
01 Day Surgery Patients								· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Munro et al, 1994	21	107.00(23.00)	21	116.00(28.00)				40.28	-9.00 [-24.50, 6.50]
Gunter, 1995	49	226.00(109.00)	47	229.00(70.00)				7.26	-3.00 [-39.50, 33.50]
Mendel et al. 1995	18	160.00(48.00)	18	134.00(38.00)		+-		12.10	26.00 [-2.28, 54.28]
Purday et al, 1996	90	76.67(23.37)	3	75.00(13.00)				40.36	1.67 [-13.81, 17.15]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	178		89				•	100.00	-0.02 [-9.86, 9.81]
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2	= 4.61, df = 3 (F	^o = 0.20), i ^z = 35.0%				T			· · ·
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.00 (P = 1.00)								
02 Inpatients									
Gupta et al, 2005	35	7200.00(17280.00)	35	5760.00(6840.00)	←			→ 100.00	1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94]
Subtotal (95% CI)	35		35		Ì			100.00	1440.00 [-4716.94, 7596.94]
Test for heterogeneity: not a	pplicable								· · ·
Test for overall effect: Z = 0	.46 (P = 0.65)								
					-100	-50 0	50	100	· · · ································
					Favour	's Ketorolac	Favours Op	ioids	
Figure A-13.

Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Had Any Post-Operative Nausea and Vomiting

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 08 N&V- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 01 Had any N&V post-operativly

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac Opioids RR (random) n/N n/N 95% Cl		RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 All surgeries	<u>, </u>			····	
Maunuksela, 1992	2/61	2/31		4,96	0.51 [0.08. 3.44]
Watcha, 1992	8/32	18/31		15.66	0.43 [0.22, 0.84]
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21		6.93	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47	-	21.24	0.79 [0.62. 1.00]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18		4.72	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Purday et al, 1996	12/90	16/30		16.32	0.25 [0.13, 0.47]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	22/54	4/48		11.52	4.89 [1.81, 13.18]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26	-=-	14.69	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32		3.96	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	376	284	•	100.00	0.53 [0.29, 0.96]
Total events: 86 (Ketorolac), 1	114 (Opioids)		+		- , -
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 =$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.0$	35.79, df = 8 (P < 0.0001), i ² 09 (P = 0.04)	= 77.6%			
02 Tonsillectomy with/without	adenoidectomy				
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47		84.30	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32		15.70	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	74	79	•	100.00	0.78 [0.61, 0.99]
Total events: 33 (Ketorolac), 4 Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = Test for overall effect: Z = 2.0	42 (Opioids) 0.32, df = 1 (P = 0.57), l² = 0º 01 (P = 0.04)	%			
03 Strabismus repair					
Munro et al. 1994	2/21	5/21		26.30	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18		17.92	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26		55.78	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Subtotal (95% CI)	65	65		100.00	0.30 [0.16, 0.56]
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 32	2 (Opioids)		Ŧ		· –
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	0.95, df = 2 (P = 0.62), l ² = 0 ⁴	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.7	/5 (P = 0.0002)				
• · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		0.00	1 0.01 0.1 1 10 10	0 1000	

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure A-14.

Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Day Surgery Patients vs. Inpatients

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 08 N&V- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 02 Day surgery patients vs Inpatients

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 Day Surgery Patients					· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21	— — — — — — —	12.52	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47	-	26.39	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18		9.18	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Purday et al, 1996	12/90	16/30	-=	22.71	0.25 [0.13, 0.47]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26	-#-	21.30	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32	·····	7.90	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% CI)	229	174	•	100.00	0.37 [0.18, 0.77]
Total events: 54 (Ketorolac), 9	90 (Opioids)				· , ·
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	23.18, df = 5 (P = 0.0003), l ²	= 78.4%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.6	3 (P = 0.008)				
02 Inpatients					
Maunuksela, 1992	2/61	2/31	_	19.18	0.51 [0.08. 3.44]
Watcha, 1992	8/32	18/31		44.40	0.43 [0.22, 0.84]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	22/54	4/48		36.42	4.89 [1.81, 13,18]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	147	110		100.00	1.06 [0.17, 6.64]
Total events: 32 (Ketorolac), 2	24 (Opioids)				,,
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	17.38, df = 2 (P = 0.0002), l ²	= 88.5%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.0	16 (P = 0.95)				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		(0.001 0.01 0.1 1 10 10	0 1000	
			Favours Ketorolac Favours Opic	pids	

Figure A-15.

Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - High Dose Ketorolac vs. Low Dose Ketorolac

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 08 N&V- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 03 High dose Keotoriac vs Low dose Ketorolac

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.6	6 mg/kg/dose)				
Watcha, 1992	8/32	18/31		15.79	0.43 [0.22, 0.84]
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21		8.92	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Gunter, 1995	32/49	39/47	=	18.81	0.79 [0.62, 1.00]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	8/18	_	6.54	0.13 [0.02, 0.90]
Purday et al, 1996	12/90	16/30	-#-	16.19	0.25 [0.13, 0.47]
Lieh-Lai, 1999	22/54	4/48		12.95	4.89 [1.81, 13.18]
Shende, 1999	6/26	19/26		15.18	0.32 [0.15, 0.66]
Keidan et al, 2004	1/25	3/32		5.63	0.43 [0.05, 3.86]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	315	253	•	100.00	0.53 [0.28, 0.99]
Total events: 84 (Ketorolac), 7	112 (Opioids)				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	35.72, df = 7 (P < 0.00001), P	[;] = 80.4%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.9	98 (P = 0.05)				
02 Low dose ketorolac (<=0.5	5 mg/kg/dose)				
Maunuksela, 1992	2/61	2/31		100.00	0.51 [0.08, 3.44]
Subtotal (95% CI)	61	31		100.00	0.51 [0.08, 3.44]
Total events: 2 (Ketorolac), 2	(Opioids)				
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.6	59 (P = 0.49)				
		0.00	1 0.01 0.1 1 10 10	0 1000	

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure A-16.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Any Post-Operative Bleeding Event

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 01 Any bleeding event

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 All surgeries					
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31			Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al. 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Purday et al. 1996	0/90	0/30			Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48			Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26			Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32			Not estimable
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35	+	12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	329	267		100.00	0.96 [0.35, 2.60]
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 (Opioids)			Ī		
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.00$, df = Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.08$ (P = 0.9	1 (P = 0.97), I² = 09 3)	*			
02 Tonsillecotmy with/without adenoide	ctomy				
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47	#	100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Keidan et al. 2004	0/25	0/32			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	74	79		100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (Opioids)			Т		
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.09 (P = 0.9	3)				
03 Strabismus repair					
Mendel et al. 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	44	44			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Opioids)					
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: not applicable					
04 Cardiac surgery					
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35		100.00	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	35	35		100.00	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 (Opioids)					
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable			l l		
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.0	0)				
		0.01		100	
		0.01		nioido	

Figure A-17.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Milliliters of Blood Loss in Drains

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids 02 Drain blood loss (mls)								
Study or sub-category	1	1	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)	VVM 9	D (fixed) 5% Cl	Weight %	VVMD (fixed) 95% Cl
Gupta et al, 20	05	35	13.30(4.50)	35	16.50(5.25)			100.00	-3.20 [-5.49, -0.91]
Total (95% Cl) Test for heterog Test for overall (eneity: not applicable effect: Z = 2.74 (P = (35).006)		35		-		100.00	-3.20 [-5.49, -0.91]
						-10 -5 Favours Ketorolad	0 5 : Favours Opi	ioids	

Figure A-18.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Bleeding Time

Review: Th Comparison: 10 Outcome: 03	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids 03 Bleeding time									
Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Opioids Mean (SD)		١	MMD (fixed) 95% Cl		₩eight %	VVMD (fixed) 95% Cl
Lieh-Lai, 1999	54	6.00(4.00)	48	6.00(6.00)					100.00	0.00 [-2.00, 2.00]
Total (95% CI) Test for heterogene Test for overall effe	54 htty: not applicable ect: Z = 0.00 (P = 1.00)		48				+		100.00	0.00 [-2.00, 2.00]
	······				-10	-5	0	5	10	
					Favo	ours Ketor	olac Favo	ours Opioi	ids	

Figure A-19.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Requiring Readmission to Hospital or Re-operation Due to Bleeding

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs OpioidsOutcome:04 Readmission/Reoperation								
Study or sub-category	Ketoro n/N	blac Opioid: I n/N	:	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl		
Watcha, 1992 Gunter, 1995	0/3 3/4	2 0/31 9 1/47			100.00	Not estimable 2.69 [0.37, 19.73]		
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 3 (Test for hetero <u>o</u> Test for overall	8 (Ketorolac), 1 (Opioids) jeneity: not applicable effect: Z = 0.97 (P = 0.33)	1 78			100.00	2.69 [0.37, 19.73]		
			0.001 0.01 0. Favours Keto	1 1 10 ⁻ rolac Favours Op	pioids			

Figure A-20.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Inpatients vs. Outpatients

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 05 Inpatients vs Day surgery patients

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N		P: 9	eto OR 5% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 Inpatients							
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31					Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48					Not estimable
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35			-	12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	121	114			_	12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 (O	pioids)			_	T		· · ·
Test for heterogeneity: not applie	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00	(P = 1.00)						
02 Daysurgery Patients							
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47				87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Т		Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30					Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26					Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	208	153		-		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (O	pioids)				T		
Test for heterogeneity: not applie	cable						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.09	(P = 0.93)				·		
Total (95% CI)	329	267		-		100.00	0.96 [0.35, 2.60]
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 (O	pioids)				T		·····
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.0	00, df = 1 (P = 0.97), I ² = 0%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.08	(P = 0.93)						
			0.01	0.1	1 10	100	
			Favr	ours Ketorolar	: Favours O	pioids	

Figure A-21.

Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - High Dose Ketorolac vs. Low Dose Ketorolac

The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review Review:

10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids Comparison:

06 High dose Ketorolac vs Low dose Ketorolac Outcome:

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n <i>i</i> N			Peto OR 95% Cl	V√eight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.6 r	ng/kg/dose)						
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31					Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		-		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18					Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30					Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48					Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26					Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	294	232		-		87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (C)pioids)				T		
Test for heterogeneity: not appli	icable						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.09	(P = 0.93)						
02 Low dose Ketorolac (<=0.5 r	ng/kg/dose)						
Gupta et al, 2005	1/35	1/35			b	- 12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	35	35				- 12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 (C)pioids)				T		
Test for heterogeneity: not appli	icable						
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.00	(P = 1.00)						
Total (95% Cl)	329	267		-		100 00	0 96 10 35 2 601
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 (C	 Dpioids)				T		,
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0$.	.00. df = 1 (P = 0.97). i ² = 0%	1					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.08	(P = 0.93)						
			0.01	0.1	1 10	100	
			Favo	urs Ketorol	ac Favours C	pioids	

Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Figure A-22.

Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Dose Duration >24 Hours vs. Dose Duration <24 Hours

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 07 > 24 hours doing vs <24 hour dosing

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N			Peto OR 95% Cl		Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 >24 hour dosing		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·						
Gupta et al. 2005	1/35	1/35					12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Subtotal (95% CI)	35	35		_		_	12.77	1.00 [0.06, 16.32]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 1 ((Opioids)							· · ·
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.0$	IO (P = 1.00)							
02 <24 hour dosing								
Watcha, 1992	0/32	0/31						Not estimable
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47					87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			T			Not estimable
Purday et al, 1996	0/90	0/30						Not estimable
Lieh-Lai, 1999	0/54	0/48						Not estimable
Shende, 1999	0/26	0/26						Not estimable
Keidan et al, 2004	0/25	0/32						Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	294	232					87.23	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 a	(Opioids)				Ī			
Test for heterogeneity: not app	plicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.0	9 (P = 0.93)							
Total (95% CI)	329	267			-		100.00	0.96 [0.35, 2.60]
Total events: 9 (Ketorolac), 9 ((Opioids)				T			- , -
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.00, df = 1 (P = 0.97), l ² = 0%							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.0	18 (P = 0.93)							
			0.01	0.1	1	10	100	
			Favo	ours Ketor	olac Fav	ours Opio	ids	

Figure A-23.

Bleeding - Gunter et al. Study

The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review Review: 10 Bleeding Events- Ketorolac vs Opioids Comparison: Out

tcome:	08 Gunter	et	ai	Study	

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 Bleeding events <24 hours					
Gunter, 1995	13/49	2/47		100.00	5.32 [1.78, 15.93]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	5.32 [1.78, 15.93]
Total events: 13 (Ketorolac), 2 (Opiola	IS)				
Test for neterogeneity: not applicable	003)				
Test for overall effect. 2 = 2.35 (F = 0	.000)				
02 Bleeding events >24 hours					
Gunter, 1995	7/49	12/47		100.00	0.50 [0.18, 1.35]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	0.50 [0.18, 1.35]
Total events: 7 (Ketorolac), 12 (Opioid	ls)				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.38 (P = 0	.17)				
03 Post-operative bleeding requiring re	e-operation				
Gunter, 1995	2/49	1/47		100.00	1.89 [0.1 9, 18.66]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	1.89 [0.19, 18.66]
Total events: 2 (Ketorolac), 1 (Opioids	;)				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.55 (P = 0	.58)				
09 Any Bleeding					
Gunter, 1995	8/49	8/47		100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	0.95 [0.33, 2.77]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 8 (Opioids	;)		Т		
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable	-				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.09 (P = 0	.93)				
10 Major bleeding					
Gunter, 1995	6/49	5/47		100.00	1.17 [0.34, 4.08]
Subtotal (95% CI)	49	47		100.00	1.17 [0.34, 4.08]
Total events: 6 (Ketorolac), 5 (Opioids	;)				- -
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable	-				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.25 (P = 0	.81)				
			·····	400	
		0.0	ท 0.1 1 10	100	

Favours Ketorolac Favours Opioids

Figure A-24.

Maladaptive Behaviors – Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Post-Operative Agitation

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:12 Post-operative maladaptive behaviors - Ketorolac vs OpioidsOutcome:02 Aggitated

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	V√eight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 Recovery Room (PARR)		,			
Keidan et al, 2004	18/25	12/32		100.00	1.92 [1.15, 3.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)	25	32	•	100.00	1.92 [1.15, 3.20]
Total events: 18 (Ketorolac), 12	2 (Opioids)				
Test for heterogeneity: not app	blicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.57	1 (P = 0.01)				
02 Day surgery unit					
Keidan et al, 2004	3/25	4/32		100.00	0.96 [0.24, 3.90]
Subtotal (95% CI)	25	32		100.00	0.96 [0.24, 3.90]
Total events: 3 (Ketorolac), 4 (Opioids)		Ī		
Test for heterogeneity: not app	blicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.06	6 (P = 0.95)				
		0.	001 0.01 0.1 1 10 1	00 1000	
			Favours Ketorolac Favours Op	ioids	

Figure A-25.

Maladaptive Behaviors - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Abnormal Nighttime Sleeping Pattern

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:12 Post-operative maladaptive behaviors - Ketorolac vs Opioids

Outcome: 03 Abnormal night time sleeping pattern

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Opioids n/N	RR (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (random) 95% Cl
01 Day of surgery				,	
Keidan et al, 2004	15/25	10/32		100.00	1.92 [1.05, 3.52]
Subtotal (95% CI)	25	32		100.00	1.92 [1.05, 3.52]
Total events: 15 (Ketorolac), 1	0 (Opioids)		-		
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.1	1 (P = 0.03)				
02 First post-operative day					
Keidan et al, 2004	8/25	7/32		100.00	1.46 [0.61, 3.49]
Subtotal (95% CI)	25	32		100.00	1.46 [0.61, 3.49]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 7 i	(Opioids)		-		-
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.8	6 (P = 0.39)				
			0.01 0.1 1 1	0 100	
			Favours Ketorolac Favours	Opioids	

Figure A-26.

Poker Chip Scale- Ketorolac vs. Placebo - First Reported Pain Score

Outcome: 01 Poker	Chip	es - Reforolaci vis Placebo								
Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)		۷	MD (fix 95% C	ed) I	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl
01 First Reported Pain Scor	re									
Romsing, 1998	40	1.55(0.80)	20	2.30(0.90)		-	<u></u>		100.00	-0.75 [-1.22, -0.28]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	40		20			•	•		100.00	-0.75 [-1.22, -0.28]
Test for heterogeneity: not	applicable						- I			
Test for overall effect: Z =	3.16 (P = 0.002)									
		n*			-4	-2		2	4	
					Favo	urs Ketor	olac F	avours Plac	ebo	

Figure A-27.

Review:

Objective Pain Scale - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - First Reported Pain Scores

The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: (Outcome: ()2 Self Reported Pain Sca)2 OPS	ales - Ketorolac vs Placebo					
Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)	VVMD (random) 95% Cl	Weight %	WMD (random) 95% Cl
01 First Reported	Pain Score	. <u>#</u> =			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Watcha, 1992	32	1.00(2.25)	32	4.00(2.25)		49.94	-3.00 [-4.10, -1.90]
Mendel et al, 199	5 18	2.70(1.70)	18	2.20(1.60)		50.06	0.50 [-0.58, 1.58]
Subtotal (95% CI)	50		50			100.00	-1.25 [-4.68, 2.18]
Test for heteroger Test for overall ef	neity: Chi² = 19.78, df = 1 fect: Z = 0.71 (P = 0.48)	(P < 0.00001), l ² = 94.9%			-		

-10

-5

Ó

Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo

5

Figure A-28.

Self Reported Pain Scales - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Post-operative bladder spasms

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:02 Self Reported Pain Scales - Ketorolac vs PlaceboOutcome:03 Bladder Spasms

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Placebo RR (fixed) Wi n/N 95% Cl		RR (fixed) 95% Cl
Park et al, 2000	3/12	10/12		100.00	0.30 [0.11, 0.83]
Total (95% CI) Total events: 3 (Ketorolac), 1 Test for heterogeneity: not a Test for overall effect: Z = 2	12 10 (Placebo) applicable .33 (P = 0.02)	12		100.00	0.30 [0.11, 0.83]
	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	·····	0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2	5 10	
			Favours Ketorolac Favours P	lacebo	

Figure A-29.

Rescue Dosing – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Patients Requiring Post-Operative PRN Medications

Review: Ti Comparison: 0: Outcome: 0:	he Role of Intravenous Kei 5 Rescue Dosing - Ketorol 1 Patients requiring PRN m	orolac in the Pain Co ac vs Placebo edications for pain	ntrol of Post-Opera	ative Pediatric Patier	nts: A Systematic	Review	
Study or sub-category	Keto n	rolac N	Placebo n/N		RR (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (fixed) 95% Cl
Mendel et al, 1995	13/	18	14/18		_ _	100.00	0.93 [0.64, 1.36]
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 13 (K Test for heterogen Test for overall eff	ietorolac), 14 (Placebo) eity: not applicable ect: Z = 0.38 (P = 0.70)	18	18		+	100.00	0.93 [0.64, 1.36]

Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo

Figure A-30.

Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs. Opioids - Micrograms of Fentanyl Required Post-Operatively for Pain Control

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 05 Rescue Dosing - Ketorolac vs Placebo 02 Micrograms of fentanyl required for pain control in recovery room											
Study or sub-category	¥	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)	VVMD (959	(fixed) 6 Cl	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl			
Sutters et al, 1	1999	36	19.71(31.46)	32	46.50(58.95)			100.00	-26.79 [-49.65, -3.93]			
Total (95% Cl) Test for heterog Test for overall	geneity: not applicabl effect: Z = 2.30 (P =	36 e 0.02)		32		-		100.00	-26.79 [-49.65, -3.93]			
						-100 -50 t Favours Ketorolac) 50 Favours Pla	100 cebo				

Figure A-31.

Time to Discharge – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Discharge from Recovery Room (PARR)

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 07 Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 01 Discharge from Recovery Room (PARR) (mins)

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)	VMD (fi: 95% (xed) Cl	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl
01 All Surgeries								·
Watcha, 1992	32	35.80(10.70)	32	46.00(14.20)	amitia Status		97.87	-10.20 [-16.36, -4.04]
Munro et al, 2002	20	301.00(63.00)	15	331.00(62.00)		-	2.13	-30.00 [-71.79, 11.79]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	52		47		♦		100.00	-10.62 [-16.72, -4.53]
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ²	= 0.84, df = 1 (F	° = 0.36), I² = 0%			•			·
Test for overall effect: Z = 3	3.42 (P = 0.0006))						
02 Orthopedic Surgery								
Munro et al, 2002	20	301.00(63.00)	15	331.00(62.00)		-	100.00	-30.00 [-71.79, 11.79]
Subtotal (95% CI)	20		15			-	100.00	-30.00 [-71.79, 11.79]
Test for heterogeneity: not a	applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1	.41 (P = 0.16)							
•					-100 -50 0	50	100	
					Favours Ketorolac	Favours Placebo	1	

Figure A-32.

Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Discharge from Hospital

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 07 Time to Discharge - Ketorolac vs Placebo

 Outcome:
 02 Discharge from Hospital (mins)

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)		WMD (random) 95% Cl	1	Weight %	WMD (random) 95% Cl
Mendel et al, 1995	18	160.00(48.00)	18	159.00(38.00)				67.37	1.00 [-27.28, 29.28]
Sutters et al, 1999	36	3694.20(2067.00)	32	4707.00(2763.60)	←			32.63	-1012.80 [-2184.44, 158.84]
Total (95% Cl) Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² Test for overall effect: Z = 0	54 * = 2.87, df = 1 (0.69 (P = 0.49)	(P = 0.09), ² = 65.2%	50					100.00	-329.76 [-1261.35, 601.84]
				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-100	-50 0	50 1		
					Favo	ours Ketorolac Favo	urs Placebo		

Figure A-33.

Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Any Post Operative Nausea and Vomiting

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 09 N&V - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 01 Had any N&V post-operativly

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N		RF	(fixed) 5% Cl	Weight %	RR (fi×ed) 95% Cl
	<u>.</u>			· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·			
Ut All surgeries	0 (02	10.000			_	~~ ~~	0 (5 (0 00 1 41)
Watcha, 1992 Mandal et al. 1995	8/32	12/32				33.30	0.67 [0.32, 1.41]
Remained 1009	1/18	2/18				5.55	
Suffere et al 1990	3/40	7720			<u>_</u>	25.90	0.36 [0.13, 0.98]
Sutters et al. 1999 Dark et al. 2000	14/36	12/32				35.26	1.04 [0.57, 1.90]
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12			•		Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	->	114		•	-	100.00	0.71 [0.47, 1.07]
Total events: 26 (Ketorolac), 33 (Placeb	0) 0 /0 - 0 0 /0 /7 - 4	4.000					
Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.38$, $dt = 3.38$, dt	3 (P = 0.34), F = 1	1.3%					
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.63 (P = 0.1	0)						
02 Tonsilectomy with/without adenoided	tomy						
Romsing, 1998	5/40	7/20			_	100.00	0.36 [0.13, 0.98]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	40	20				100.00	0.36 [0.13, 0.98]
Total events: 5 (Ketorolac), 7 (Placebo)				-			- •
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.99 (P = 0.0	5)						
	•						
03 Strabismus repair							
Munro et al, 1994	2/21	5/21				100.00	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Subtotal (95% CI)	21	21				100.00	0.40 [0.09, 1.84]
Total events: 2 (Ketorolac), 5 (Placebo)							
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.18 (P = 0.2	4)						
	•						
04 Ureteral Repair							
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	12	12					Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo)							
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					1		
Test for overall effect: not applicable							
		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.01	0.1	1 10	100	· · ·
			Favo	urs Ketorola	= Favours P	lacebo	

Figure A-34.

Nausea and Vomiting – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Day Surgery Patients vs. Inpatients

Review:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review
Comparison:	09 N&V - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 02 Day surgery patients vs Inpatients

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac	Placebo DM			RR (fixed)		Weight %	RR (fixed)
							,0	
01 Daysurgery Patients								
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	2/18					100.00	0.50 [0.05, 5.04]
Subtotal (95% Cl)	18	18					100.00	0.50 [0.05, 5.04]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac), 2	(Placebo)				-			
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.5	i9 (P = 0.56)							
02 Inpatients								
Watcha, 1992	8/32	12/32		-	┈═┼╴		35.25	0.67 [0.32, 1.41]
Romsing, 1998	5/40	7/20					27.42	0.36 [0.13, 0.98]
Sutters et al, 1999	14/36	12/32					37.33	1.04 [0.57, 1.90]
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12						Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	120	96			+		100.00	0.72 [0.47, 1.10]
Total events: 27 (Ketorolac), 3	31 (Placebo)							
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	3.27, df = 2 (P = 0.20), l ² = 38	3.8%						
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.5	i3 (P = 0.13)							
			0.01	0.1	1	10	100	
			Favo	ours Ketoro	lac Favou	irs Place	ebo	

Figure A-35.

Nausea and Vomiting - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - High Dose Ketorolac vs. Low Dose Ketorolac

Review:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review
Comparison:	09 N&V - Ketorolac vs Placebo
Outcome:	03 High dose Ketorolac vs Low dose Ketorolac

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	RR (fixed) 95% Cl	Weight %	RR (fixed) 95% Cl
01 High dose Ketorolac (>=0.6	ing/kg/dose)				
Watcha, 1992	8/32	12/32		33.30	0.67 [0.32, 1.41]
Mendel et al, 1995	1/18	2/18		5.55	0.50 [0.05, 5.04]
Romsing, 1998	5/40	7/20		25.90	0.36 [0.13, 0.98]
Sutters et al, 1999	14/36	12/32		35.26	1.04 [0.57, 1.90]
Subtotal (95% CI)	126	102		100.00	0.71 [0.47, 1.07]
Total events: 28 (Ketorolac), 3	33 (Placebo)				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 3	3.38, df = 3 (P = 0.34), P = 11	.3%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.6	3 (P = 0.10)				
02 Low dose Ketorolac (<=0.5	5 mg/kg/dose)				
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	12	12			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 ((Placebo)				
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable				
Test for overall effect: not app	, olicable				
			0.01 0.1 1 10	100	

Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo

Figure A-36.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Any Post-Operative Bleeding Event

 Review:
 The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

 Comparison:
 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 01 Any bleeding event

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl
01 All surgeries		<u> </u>			
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32		7.72	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15		46.14	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32			Not estimable
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	128	109		53.86	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5 (Placebo) Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.26, df =) = 1 (P = 0.61), i² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.1	17)				
02 Tonsillectomy with/without adenoide	ectomy				
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15		46.14	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Subtotal (95% CI)	30	15		46.14	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 4 (Placebo))				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.09$ (P = 0.3	28)				
03 Strabismus surgery					
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	18	18			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo))				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: not applicable					
04 Ureteral reimplant					
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	12	12			Not estimable
 Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo))				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: not applicable					
Total (95% CI)	188	154	-	100.00	0.38 [0.13, 1.12]
Total events: 8 (Ketorolac), 9 (Placebo))				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.28, df =	= 2 (P = 0.87), I ² = 0	%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.76$ (P = 0.0	08)				
		0.0	01 0.01 0.1 1 10	100 1000	
			Favours Ketorolac 💿 Favours Pl	acebo	

Figure A-37.

Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Pre/Intra-operative Blood Loss

Review: Comparison:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo	Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A S	ystematic Review
Outcome:	02 Intraoperative blood loss		

Study or sub-category	N	Ketorolac Mean (SD)	N	Placebo Mean (SD)		v	VMD (fixed) 95% Cl)	Weight %	WMD (fixed) 95% Cl
Romsing, 1998	40	3.15(2.50)	20	3.10(2.00)			-		100.00	0.05 [-1.12, 1.22]
Total (95% Cl) Test for heterogeneity: no Test for overall effect: Z =	40 t applicable = 0.08 (P = 0.93)		20				+		100.00	0.05 [-1.12, 1.22]
					-10	-5	Ó	5	10	
	Favours Ketorolac Favours Placebo									

Figure A-38.

Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Patients Requiring Post-Operative Blood Transfusions

Review: Comparison: Outcome:	The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo 03 Postoperative transfusions							
Study or sub-category	/	Ketorolac n/N	Placebo n/N	Peto OR 95% Cl	Weight %	Peto OR 95% Cl		
Sutters et al, 1 Munro et al, 20	999 02	0/36 4/20	0/32 3/15		100.00	Not estimable 1.00 [0.19, 5.20]		
Total (95% Cl) Total events: 4 Test for heterog Test for overall	(Ketorolac), 3 (Place geneity: not applicabl effect: Z = 0.00 (P =	56 bo) e 1.00)	47	-	100.00	1.00 [0.19, 5.20]		
				0.001 0.01 0.1 1 10 1 Favours Ketorolac Favours Pla	00 1000 acebo			

Figure A-39.

Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Requiring Readmission to Hospital or Re-operation

Study	Ketorolac	Placebo	Peto OR	Weight	Peto OR
or sub-category	n/N	n/N	95% Cl	% 95% CI	
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32		52.94	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Romsing, 1998	1/30	0/15			4.48 [0.07, 286.49]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32			Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	98	79		100.00	0.70 [0.04, 12.17]
Total events: 1 (Ketorolac),1 :	(Placebo)				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi2 =	1.44, df = 1 (P = 0.23), l ² = 30	.6%			
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.2	4 (P = 0.81)				

Figure A-40.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Inpatients vs. Day Surgery

Review:The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic ReviewComparison:11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs PlaceboOutcome:05 Day surgery patients vs Inpatients

Study	Ketorolac	Placebo	Peto OR	Weight	Peto OR
or sub-category	nN	n/N	95% Cl	%	95% CI
01 Inpatients		······································			
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32	←───■ ─── │	14.33	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15		85.67	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32			Not estimable
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	110	91		100.00	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5 (Placebo	i)				
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.26, df	- = 1 (P = 0.61), I ² = 0%	6			
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.	.17)				
02 Day Surgery Patients					
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18			Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	18	18			Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0 (Placebo)				
Test for heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: not applicable					
		0	.01 0.1 1 10	100	
			Favours Ketorolac Favours Pla	cebo	

Figure A-41.

Bleeding - Ketorolac vs. Placebo - High Dose Ketorolac vs. Low Dose Ketorolac

Studie	Kataralaa	Discolo			Data OR	10 /oight	Pate OR
or sub-category	n/N	Piacebu Nu			95% CI	weight %	95% CI
			<u>.</u>				
01 High dose K <mark>eto</mark> r	rolac (>=0.6 mg/kg/dose)						
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32	←			14.33	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18					Not estimable
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15			▇┤─	85.67	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	116	97				100.00	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ke	torolac), 5 (Placebo)				_		
Test for heterogen	eity: Chi² = 0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61), l² = 0'	%					
Test for overall eff	ect: Z = 1.39 (P = 0.17)						
02 Low dose Keto	rolac (<=0.5 mg/kg/dose)						
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12					Not estimable
Subtotal (95% CI)	12	12					Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ke	torolac), 0 (Placebo)						
Test for heterogen	eity: not applicable						
Test for overall eff	ect: not applicable						
			0.01		1 10	100	
			0.01	0.1	, IU	100	
			ravo	urs ketor	olac Favours Pl	acepo	

Figure A-42.

Bleeding – Ketorolac vs. Placebo - Dose Duration >24 Hours vs. Dose Duration <24 Hours

Review: The Role of Intravenous Ketorolac in the Pain Control of Post-Operative Pediatric Patients: A Systematic Review

Comparison: 11 Bleeding Events - Ketorolac vs Placebo

Outcome: 07 >24 hour dosing duration vs <24 hour dosing duration

Study or sub-category	Ketorolac	Placebo		Peto OF	: Weight	Peto OR 95% Cl
		HAN				
01 >24 hour dosing duration						
Sutters et al, 1999	0/36	0/32				Not estimable
Park et al, 2000	0/12	0/12				Not estimable
Subtotal (95% Cl)	48	44				Not estimable
Total events: 0 (Ketorolac), 0	(Placebo)					
Test for heterogeneity: not ap	plicable					
Test for overall effect: not ap	plicable					
02 <24 hour dosing duration						
Watcha, 1992	0/32	1/32			14.33	0.14 [0.00, 6.82]
Mendel et al, 1995	0/18	0/18				Not estimable
Romsing, 1998	4/30	4/15			85.67	0.41 [0.08, 2.04]
Subtotal (95% CI)	80	65			100.00	0.35 [0.08, 1.54]
Total events: 4 (Ketorolac), 5	(Placebo)			_		
Test for heterogeneity: Chi ² =	0.26, df = 1 (P = 0.61), l ² = 0%	6				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.	39 (P = 0.17)					
			0.01	0.1 1	10 100	······
			Favo	ours Ketorolac 🛛 Fa	avours Placebo	

.