

Supplementary material

Drozd A, Smereka J, Filipiak KJ, et al. Intraosseous versus intravenous access while wearing personal protective equipment: a meta-analysis in the era of COVID-19. Kardiol Pol. 2021; 79: 277-286. doi:10.33963/KP.15741

Please note that the journal is not responsible for the scientific accuracy or functionality of any supplementary material submitted by the authors. Any queries (except missing content) should be directed to the corresponding author of the article.

Supplementary Table S1. Comparison of intraosseous access times with and without personal protective equipment

	Number of trials	MD or RR (95%CI)	P value	I ² statistic, %
Operator type				
Physicians	1	10(8.42, 11.58)	<0.001	N/A
Paramedics	3	11.46(3.62, 19.31)	0.004	94%
Mixed staff	4	15.44(11.13, 19.75)	<0.001	47%
Intraosseous device type				
EZ-IO	6	11.32(3.84, 18.79)	0.003	97%
BIG	2	9.78(8.27, 11.29)	<0.001	0%
Jamshidi	1	34.50(23.62, 45.38)	<0.001	N/A

Abbreviations: N/A, Not applicable; IO, intraosseous access; BIG, Bone Injection Gun.

Supplementary Table S2. Comparison of intraosseous access times with peripheral intravenous access times under personal protective equipment.

	Number of trials	Efficacy IO	Efficacy PIV	RR or MD (95%CI)	P value	I² statistic, %
Procedure time						
Paramedics	2	N/A	NA	-21.79(-29.56, -23.04)	<0.001	95%
Mixed staff	3	N/A	NA	-26.30(-29.56, -23.04)	0.008	97%
Success rate						
Paramedics	1	100%	91.4%	1.09(0.97, 1.22)	0.13	N/A
Mixed staff	3	100%	89.9%	1.09 (0.90, 1.29)	0.44	88%

Abbreviations: N/A, Not applicable; IO, intraosseous access; PIV, Peripheral intravenous access.