**Supplement 4 -** Assessment of the quality of evidence using GRADE for the outcomes included in the meta-analysis

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Outcomes** | **Number of participants (studies)** | **Relative effect(CI 95%)** | **Potential absolute effects (95% CI)** | **Certainty of evidence** |
| **Conventional Therapy** | **Continuous lateral rotation therapy** | **Difference** |
| Mortality | 1267(14 ECRs) | OR 1.04(0.80, 1.34) | 28.3% | 29.1%(24, 34.6) | 0.8% more (4.3 fewer to 6.3 more) | ⨁◯◯◯Very low a, b |
| Length of stay in ICU (days) | 970(11 ECRs) | - | - | - | SMD -0.11(-0.25, 0.02) | ⨁⨁⨁◯Moderate c |
| Length of hospital stay (days) | 737(8 ECRs) | - | - | - | SMD -0.10(-0.31, 0.11) | ⨁◯◯◯Very low b, d, e |
| Mechanical ventilation duration (days) | 1044(10 ECRs) | - | - | - | SMD -0.17 (-0.29, -0.04) | ⨁⨁⨁◯Moderate f |
| Incidence of pneumonia | 1145(11 ECRs) | OR 0.39(0.29, 0.52) | 32.3% | 15.7%(12.1, 19.9) | 16.6% fewer (20.1 fewer to 12.4 fewer) | ⨁⨁⨁◯Moderate g |
| Pressure ulcers | 407(4 ECRs)  | OR 0.73(0.34, 1.60) | 24.5% | 19.2%(9.9, 34.2) | 5.4% fewer(14.6 fewer to 9.7 more) | ⨁◯◯◯Very low h, i, j |
| \*The risk in the intervention group (and its 95% confidence interval) is based on the assumed risk of the comparator group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI).CI: Confidence interval; OR: Odds ratio; SMD: Standardized Mean Difference. |
| GRADE Working Group grades of evidenceHigh certainty: We are very confident that the true effect approximates the effect estimate.Moderate certainty: We are moderately confident in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be close to the effect estimate, but there is a possibility that it could be substantially different.Low certainty: Our confidence in the effect estimate is limited: the true effect may be substantially different from the effect estimate.Very low certainty: We have very little confidence in the effect estimate: the true effect is likely to be substantially different from the effect estimate. |
| Explanationsa. Nine studies with a high risk of bias in at least one of their domains and presenting concerns in all others (weight 70.3%) - minus two points.b. 95% CI crosses the line of no effect - minus 1 pointc. Seven studies presented concerns in the selection bias domain, and a further five studies with high risk of bias found in other domains - minus one pointd. Four studies with high risk of bias distributed across the domains of selection, performance, detection and attrition - minus one pointe. Variation of overlap between the 95% CI and there was inconsistency (I2 = 48%; p = 0.06) - minus 2 pointsf. Five studies with high risk of bias - minus one pointg. Despite the protective effect, seven studies presented a high risk of bias - minus one pointh. Three studies at high risk of bias with limitations in all domains (weight 83.2%) - minus two pointsi. Variation of overlap between the 95% CI and I2 = 47% - minus 1 pointj. 95% CI crosses the line of no effect and optimal information size not reached - minus 2 points |