Companionship during labour and childbirth - subgroup analysis according to the type of support person

Quality assessment						No. of participants		Effect				
No. of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Companionship during labour	Usual practice	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty (GRADE)	Importance
Spontane	eous vagina	l birth – suppoi	rt people were he	ospital staff								
9	RCTs	seriousª	not serious	serious⁵	not serious	none	3818/5418 (70.5%)	3678/5395 (68.2%)	RR 1.05 (1.01-1.09)	34 more per 1000 (from 7 more to 61 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	critical
Spontane	eous vagina	l birth - suppoi	rt people were no	ot hospital staff	and were chos	en by woman						
6	RCTs	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	528/808 (65.3%)	504/812 (62.1%)	RR 1.04 (0.97-1.11)	25 more per 1000 (from 19 fewer to 68 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	critical
Spontane	eous vagina	l birth – suppoi	rt people were no	ot hospital staff	and not chose	n by woman						
6	RCTs	seriousª	seriousc	not serious	not serious	none	783/973 (80.5%)	764/1062 (71.9%)	RR 1.15 (1.05-1.26)	108 more per 1000 (from 36 more to 187 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	critical
Caesarea	an birth – su	pport people v	vere hospital sta	ff								
9	RCTs	seriousª	not serious	serious⁵	not serious	none	613/5403 (11.3%)	648/5383 (12.0%)	RR 0.94 (0.84-1.05)	7 fewer per 1000 (from 6 more to 19 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	critical
Caesarea	an birth – su	pport people v	vere not hospital	staff and were	chosen by won	ian						
6	RCTs	not serious	seriousc	not serious	seriousf	none	160/1029 (15.5%)	200/1030 (19.4%)	RR 0.76 (0.50-1.17)	47 fewer per 1000 (from 33 more to 97 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	critical
Caesarea	an birth – su	pport people v	vere not hospital	staff and not c	hosen by woma	n						
9	RCTs	seriousª	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	175/1231 (14.2%)	272/1271 (21.4%)	RR 0.61 (0.45-0.83)	83 fewer per 1000 (from 36 fewer to 118 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	critical
Any anal	gesia/anaes	sthesia – suppo	ort people were l	nospital staff								
6	RCTs	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	not serious	none	3624/4574 (79.2%)	3757/4578 (82.1%)	RR 0.97 (0.96-0.99)	25 fewer per 1000 (from 8 fewer to 33 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	critical

Quality assessment							No. of participants		Effect			
No. of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Companionship during labour	Usual practice	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty (GRADE)	Importance
Any anal	gesia/anae	sthesia – suppo	ort people were i	not hospital sta	ff and were cho	sen by woman						
4	RCTs	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	372/704 (52.8%)	405/704 (57.5%)	RR 0.93 (0.86-1.01)	40 fewer per 1000 (from 6 more to 81 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	critical
Any anal	gesia/anae	sthesia – suppo	ort people were i	not hospital sta	ff and not chos	en by woman						
4	RCTs	not serious	serious ^c	not serious	serious ^f	none	401/851 (47.1%)	477/939 (50.8%)	RR 0.72 (0.47-1.10)	142 fewer per 1000 (from 51 more to 269 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	critical
Synthetic	c oxytocin d	uring labour -	support people v	vere hospital st	aff							
6	RCTs	seriousª	not serious	serious⁵	not serious	none	1795/4786 (37.5%)	1685/4775 (35.3%)	RR 1.01 (0.93-1.11)	4 more per 1000 (from 25 fewer to 39 more)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	critical
Synthetic	c oxytocin d	uring labour -	support people v	vere not hospita	al staff and wer	e chosen by won	nan					
7	RCTs	very serious ^e	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	501/1092 (45.9%)	533/1099 (48.5%)	RR 0.99 (0.96-1.01)	5 fewer per 1000 (from 5 more to 19 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	critical
Synthetic	c oxytocin d	uring labour -	support people v	vere not hospita	al staff and not	chosen by woma	in					,
4	RCTs	serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	79/505 (15.6%)	125/576 (21.7%)	RR 0.67 (0.43-1.06)	72 fewer per 1000 (from 13 more to 124 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	critical
Negative	rating of/n	egative feeling	s about birth ex	perience – supp	ort people wer	e hospital staff						
4	RCTs	seriousª	not serious	serious⁵	not serious	none	225/4106 (5.5%)	256/4039 (6.3%)	RR 0.87 (0.73-1.03)	8 fewer per 1000 (from 2 more to 17 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ LOW	critical
Negative	rating of/n	egative feeling	s about birth ex	perience - supp	ort people wer	e not hospital sta	aff and were chos	en by woman				
4	RCTs	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	245/833 (29.4%)	453/875 (51.8%)	RR 0.58 (0.50-0.67)	217 fewer per 1000 (from 171 fewer to 259 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	critical

	Quality assessment						No. of participants		Effect			
No. of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Companionship during labour	Usual practice	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty (GRADE)	Importance
Negative	rating of/n	egative feeling	s about birth ex	perience - supp	ort people wer	e not hospital sta	aff and not chose	n by woman				
3	RCTs	not serious	not serious	not serious	not serious	none	183/665 (27.5%)	273/660 (41.4%)	RR 0.65 (0.53-0.80)	145 fewer per 1000 (from 83 fewer to 194 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊕ HIGH	critical
Postpart	um depressi	ion – support p	people were hosp	oital staff								
1	RCT	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	not serious	none	245/2816 (8.7%)	277/2751 (10.1%)	RR 0.86 (0.73-1.02)	14 fewer per 1000 (from 2 more to 27 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	critical
Postpart	um depressi	ion – support p	people were not l	nospital staff ar	id not chosen b	y woman						
1	RCT	seriousª	not serious	not serious	serious ^d	none	8/74 (10.8%)	48/75 (64.0%)	RR 0.17 (0.09-0.33)	531 fewer per 1000 (from 429 fewer to 582 fewer)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low	critical
Postpart	um depressi	ion – support p	people were not l	nospital staff ar	d were chosen	by woman						
0	not applicable (n/a)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	critical
Exclusive	or any brea	stfeeding at a	ny time point, as	defined by tria	l authors – sup	port people were	hospital staff					
1	RCT	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	not serious	none	1312/2339 (56.1%)	1283/2220 (57.8%)	RR 0.97 (0.92-1.02)	17 fewer per 1000 (from 12 more to 46 fewer)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	critical
Exclusive	or any brea	stfeeding at a	ny time point, as	defined by tria	l authors - sup	port people were	not hospital staf	f and were ch	iosen by woma	n		
0	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	
Exclusive	e or any brea	stfeeding at a	ny time point, as	defined by tria	l authors – sup	port people were	not hospital staf	f and not cho	sen by woman			
3	RCTs	not serious	not serious	not serious	serious ^f	none	395/516 (76.6%)	356/509 (69.9%)	RR 1.11 (0.98-1.26)	77 more per 1000 (from 14 fewer to 182 more)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ MODERATE	critical

CI: confidence interval; n/a: not applicable; RCT: randomized controlled trial; RR: risk ratio.

^a Most of the pooled effect derived from studies with moderate or high risk of bias but without a substantial proportion (i.e. < 50%) from studies with high risk of bias.

^b Hodnett 2002 included high-risk pregnancies.

^c Severe, unexplained, heterogeneity ($12 \ge 60\%$ or Chi2 < 0.05).

^d Small sample size and/ or few events.

• Most of the pooled effect derived from studies with moderate or high risk of bias but with a substantial proportion (i.e. > 50%) from studies with high risk of bias.

^f The CI is imprecise.