

作者（们）：
问题: 干预用于的对比。
环境:
参考资料:

Certainty assessment							№; 患者的		效果		Certainty	重要性
№; 研究的	研究设计	偏倚风险	不一致性	间接性	精确性	其他考虑因素【注意事项】	[干预]	[对照]	相对 (95% CI)	绝对 (95% CI)		
Probing depth at 90 days (随访: 平均值 90 天数; 用___评估: mm)												
7	随机试验	严重 ^a	非常严重 ^b	不严重	严重 ^c	无	234	230	-	MD 0.12 mm 更低 (0.55 更低到 0.3 更高)	 Very low ^{a,b,c}	
Clinical attachment level at 90 days (随访: 平均值 90 天数; 用___评估: mm)												
5	随机试验	严重	不严重	不严重	不严重	无	211	209	-	MD 0.07 mm 更低 (0.25 更低到 0.12 更高)	 Moderate	
Gingival index at 90 days (随访: 平均值 90 天数; 用___评估: score)												
2	随机试验	严重 ^d	严重 ^e	不严重	严重 ^f	无	25	19	-	MD 0.42 score 更高 (0.06 更高到 0.79 更高)	 Very low ^{d,e,f}	
Sulcus bleeding index at 90 days (随访: 平均值 90 天数; 用___评估: score)												
3	随机试验	非常严重 ^g	非常严重 ^h	不严重	不严重	无	171	170	-	MD 0.72 score 更低 (1 更低 到 0.43 更低)	 Very low ^{a,h}	
Interleukin-6 at 90days (随访: 平均值 90 天数; 用___评估: Interleukin-6 concentration)												
2	随机试验	严重	非常严重 ⁱ	不严重	严重 ^j	无	64	65	-	SMD 0.69 SD 更低 (2.03 更低到 0.65 更高)	 Very low ^{i,j}	
High-sensitivity C-reactive protein at 30 days (随访: 平均值 30 天数; 用___评估: hs-CRP concentration)												
2	随机试验	非常严重 ^k	不严重	不严重	不严重	无	126	125	-	SMD 1.69 SD 更低 (1.98 更低到 1.4 更低)	 低 ^k	
Glycated haemoglobin at 90 days (随访: 平均值 90 天数; 用___评估: Glycated haemoglobin percentage (%HbA1c))												
2	随机试验	严重 ^l	严重 ^m	不严重	严重 ⁿ	无	69	71	-	MD 0.38 % 更低 (0.88 更低到 0.12 更高)	 Very low ^{l,m,n}	

CI: Confidence interval; **MD:** Mean difference; **SMD:** Standardised mean difference

Explanations

- a. Four of the nine included trials were judged to have a high risk of bias, mainly due to concerns regarding the randomization process and outcome measurement. Therefore, the certainty of evidence was downgraded by one level.
- b. Substantial heterogeneity was observed among the included studies ($I^2 = 96\%$), indicating considerable inconsistency across study results.
- c. The confidence interval crossed the line of no effect and included both potential benefit and no important difference, indicating imprecision in the effect estimate.
- d. One of the two included studies was judged to have a high risk of bias, which may have influenced the pooled estimate.
- e. The pooled estimate was sensitive to the removal of individual studies, indicating substantial uncertainty and inconsistency between study results.
- f. The evidence was based on only two small studies with a limited sample size, resulting in imprecision of the effect estimate.
- g. All three included studies were judged to have a high risk of bias, which may substantially affect the reliability of the pooled estimate.
- h. Substantial heterogeneity was observed among the included studies ($I^2=95\%$), indicating considerable inconsistency in the effect estimates.
- i. Substantial heterogeneity was observed among included studies ($I^2=92\%$), indicating considerable inconsistency in the effect estimates.
- j. The confidence interval was wide and crossed the line of no effect, indicating uncertainty in the estimated effect.
- k. Both included studies were judged to have a high risk of bias, which may substantially affect the confidence in the estimated effect.
- l. One of the two included studies was judged to have a high risk of bias, which may affect the confidence in the estimated effect.
- m. Moderate heterogeneity was observed among the included studies ($I^2=54\%$), indicating some inconsistency in the effect estimates.
- n. The confidence interval crossed the line of no effect and the sample size was limited, resulting in uncertainty of the effect estimate.