### GRADE Tables for evaluation of value of 0.9% saline solution irrigation versus tap water

**Question:** Irrigation with 0.5L 0.9% saline solution compared to irrigation with 0.5L tap water for adults and children who have a chemical burn or other unknown substance enter the conjunctival sac

**Settings:**


#### Quality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№ of studies</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Risk of bias</th>
<th>Indirectness</th>
<th>Imprecision</th>
<th>Other considerations</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrigation with 0.5L 0.9% saline solution</td>
<td>irrigation with 0.5L tap water</td>
<td>Relative (95% CI)</td>
<td>Absolute (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrigation with 1.5L 0.9% saline solution</td>
<td>irrigation with 0.5L tap water</td>
<td>Relative (95% CI)</td>
<td>Absolute (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) (follow up: range 10 - 14 minutes; assessed with: anterior chamber pH)**

1. observational studies  
   - not serious  
   - not serious  
   - very serious  
   - serious  
   - none  
   - 8  
   - 8  
   - MD 0.62 higher (0.25 higher to 0.99 higher)  
   - CRITICAL

**MD – mean difference, RR – relative risk**

1. Only animal subjects and only evaluated irrigation for corneal burns from NaOH, no other irritants  
2. Only 8 subjects in each arm of the study (100 minimum advised for precision)

**Question:** Irrigation with 1.5L 0.9% saline solution compared to irrigation with 0.5L tap water for adults and children who have a chemical burn or other unknown substance enter the conjunctival sac

**Settings:**


#### Quality assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>№ of studies</th>
<th>Study design</th>
<th>Risk of bias</th>
<th>Indirectness</th>
<th>Imprecision</th>
<th>Other considerations</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrigation with 1.5L 0.9% saline solution</td>
<td>irrigation with 0.5L tap water</td>
<td>Relative (95% CI)</td>
<td>Absolute (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrigation with 0.5L 0.9% saline solution</td>
<td>irrigation with 0.5L tap water</td>
<td>Relative (95% CI)</td>
<td>Absolute (95% CI)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) (follow up: range 9 - 15 minutes; assessed with: anterior chamber pH)**

1. observational studies  
   - not serious  
   - not serious  
   - very serious  
   - serious  
   - none  
   - 8  
   - 8  
   - MD 0.57 higher (0.035 higher to 1.105 higher)  
   - CRITICAL

**MD – mean difference, RR – relative risk**

1. Used animal subjects and only evaluated irrigation for NaOH corneal burns and no other irritants  
2. Only had 8 subjects in each arm (100 minimum advised for precision)

**Question:** Irrigation with 0.5L 0.9% saline solution compared to irrigation with 1.5L tap water for adults and children who have a chemical burn or other unknown substance enter the conjunctival sac

**Settings:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment</th>
<th>No of patients</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of studies</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Risk of bias</td>
<td>Inconsistency</td>
<td>Indirectness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 observational studies</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>very serious</td>
<td>serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD – mean difference, RR – relative risk

1. Used animals and only studied treatment of NaOH corneal burns, no other irritant
2. Only had 8 subjects in each arm (100 minimum advised for precision)

**Question:** Irrigation with 1.5L 0.9% saline solution compared to Irrigation with 1.5L tap water for adults and children who have a chemical or other unknown substance enter the conjunctival sac

**Settings:**


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality assessment</th>
<th>No of patients</th>
<th>Effect</th>
<th>Quality</th>
<th>Importance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No of studies</td>
<td>Study design</td>
<td>Risk of bias</td>
<td>Inconsistency</td>
<td>Indirectness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 observational studies</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>not serious</td>
<td>very serious</td>
<td>serious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

MD – mean difference, RR – relative risk

1. Subjects were animals and only used NaOH as the exposure with no testing of treatment for other conjunctival irritants
2. Only had 8 subjects in each arm (100 minimum advised for precision)