### SoF Tables (version 2) for evaluation of value of 0.9% saline solution irrigation versus tap water

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>№ of participants (studies) Follow-up</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects</th>
<th>Risk with irrigation with 0.9% saline solution</th>
<th>Risk difference with irrigation with 1.5L tap water</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) assessed with: anterior chamber pH follow-up: range 9 - 15 minutes</td>
<td>16 (1 observational study) 9 - 15 minutes</td>
<td>🔴🔴🔴🔴 🔴🔴🔴🔴 🔴🔴🔴🔴 🔴🔴🔴🔴</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The mean pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) in the control group was 0</td>
<td>MD 0.57 higher (0.035 higher to 1.105 higher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

Cl: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;

### GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

**High quality:** We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

**Moderate quality:** We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

**Low quality:** Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

**Very low quality:** We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

---

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)

---

### 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


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>№ of participants (studies) Follow-up</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects</th>
<th>Risk with irrigation with 1.5L tap water</th>
<th>Risk difference with irrigation with 1.5L 0.9% saline solution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) assessed with: anterior chamber pH follow-up: range 9 - 18 minutes</td>
<td>16 (1 observational study) 9 - 18 minutes</td>
<td>🔴🔴🔴🔴 🔴🔴🔴🔴 🔴🔴🔴🔴 🔴🔴🔴🔴</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The mean pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) in the control group was 0</td>
<td>MD 0.45 higher (0.09 lower to 0.994 higher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Irrigation with 1.5L 0.9% saline solution compared to irrigation with 1.5 L tap water for adults and children who have a chemical or other unknown substance enter the conjunctival sac.


*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

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)

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


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>No of participants (studies)</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) assessed with: anterior chamber pH follow up: range 10 - 14 minutes</td>
<td>16 (1 observational study) 10 - 14 minutes</td>
<td><strong>VERY LOW</strong></td>
<td>The mean pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) in the control group was 0.62 higher (0.25 higher to 0.99 higher)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect
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


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)

---

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


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>No of participants (studies) Follow-up</th>
<th>Quality of the evidence (GRADE)</th>
<th>Relative effect (95% CI)</th>
<th>Anticipated absolute effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) assessed with: anterior chamber pH follow up: range 10 - 18 minutes | 16 (1 observational study) 10 - 18 minutes | ★★★★☆ VERY LOW ★★★ || The mean pH level (Kompa, 2005, 467) in the control group was 0 MD 0.5 higher (0.119 higher to 0.881 higher)

*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).

CI: Confidence interval; RR: Risk ratio; OR: Odds ratio;

GRADE Working Group grades of evidence

High quality: We are very confident that the true effect lies close to that of the estimate of the effect

Moderate quality: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be close to the estimate of the effect, but there is a possibility that it is substantially different

Low quality: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: The true effect may be substantially different from the estimate of the effect

Very low quality: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: The true effect is likely to be substantially different from the estimate of effect

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)