

UTEROTONIC AGENTS FOR PREVENTING POSTPARTUM HAEMORRHAGE. A NETWORK META-ANALYSIS.

Supplementary Appendix

Appendix 1: Network diagrams, forest plots and rankograms for prevention of PPH ≥500 mL	and
PPH ≥1000 mL for subgroups and sensitivity analyses	3
Appendix 2: Forest plots for all outcomes and intervention comparisons	93
Appendix 3: Additional data from trialists	110

Figure 1. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by mode of birth (vaginal birth). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 2. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by mode of birth (vaginal birth).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	* *	0.61 (0.52, 0.72) 0.55 (0.41, 0.74) 0.57 (0.47, 0.70)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treat Direct Indirect Network	tment + +	0.37 (0.30, 0.48) 0.41 (0.31, 0.55) 0.40 (0.32, 0.51)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.43 (0.27, 0.67)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatr Network	ment _	0.41 (0.29, 0.57)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.55 (0.42, 0.72) 0.62 (0.50, 0.76)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	 	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 0.72 (0.53, 0.98) 0.62 (0.46, 0.84)
Injectable prostaglandinsvs Placebo or no tre Direct Indirect Network	atment	0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 0.62 (0.38, 1.01) 0.61 (0.39, 0.95)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + + +	0.72 (0.57, 0.91) 0.69 (0.52, 0.92) 0.70 (0.58, 0.85)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.87 (0.34, 1.30) 0.87 (0.29, 1.57) 0.74 (0.49, 1.12)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.71 (0.55, 0.92) 0.78 (0.33, 1.88) 0.71 (0.54, 0.93)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	*	1.08 (0.90, 1.31) 1.05 (0.79, 1.39) 1.08 (0.93, 1.24)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.31 (0.86, 1.99) 0.95 (0.68, 1.32) 1.09 (0.84, 1.40)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	_	0.84 (0.26, 2.71) 1.12 (0.68, 1.83) 1.07 (0.70, 1.63)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 1.10 (0.66, 1.83) 1.06 (0.69, 1.64)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxyto Direct Indirect Network		1.39 (0.65, 2.99) 0.91 (0.63, 1.32) 1.02 (0.74, 1.40)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	1.75 (1.35, 2.28) 1.37 (1.04, 1.79) 1.54 (1.28, 1.88)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.17 (0.01, 4.08) 1.58 (1.17, 2.14) 1.55 (1.15, 2.09)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxy Direct Indirect Network	/tocin	1.09 (0.66, 1.81) 1.77 (1.05, 2.97) 1.53 (0.99, 2.35)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network		0.96 (0.59, 1.57)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.45 (0.94, 2.23)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	_	1.46 (0.90, 2.38)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	_ •-	1.44 (0.80, 2.59)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.93 (0.99, 3.78) 1.39 (0.99, 1.98) 1.51 (1.13, 2.03)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	-	1.53 (1.06, 2.21)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxy Network	tocin	1.50 (0.91. 2.47)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.73 (0.48, 1.11) 1.01 (0.79, 1.29)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.78 (0.47, 1.29) 0.99 (0.65, 1.51)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	 	1.42 (0.64, 3.17) 0.73 (0.41, 1.30) 0.98 (0.63, 1.53)

Figure 3. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by mode of birth (vaginal birth). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 4. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by mode of birth (vaginal birth). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 5. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by mode of birth (vaginal birth).

Comparison Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		RR (95% CI)
Diréct Indirect Network	* * *	0.61 (0.51, 0.72) 0.53 (0.42, 0.68) 0.58 (0.51, 0.67)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatmen Direct Indirect Network	t 	0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.47 (0.36, 0.61) 0.47 (0.37, 0.59)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.60 (0.47, 0.75)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	-	0.47 (0.33, 0.69)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.73 (0.56, 0.95) 0.76 (0.62, 0.94) 0.75 (0.64, 0.87)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.69 (0.34, 1.41) 0.56 (0.29, 1.09)
Direct — Indirect Network		0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.38 (0.14, 1.04) 0.38 (0.15, 0.97)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.73 (0.57, 0.93) 1.00 (0.70, 1.44) 0.81 (0.66, 0.99)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.68 (0.21, 2.20) 0.55 (0.09, 3.54) 1.03 (0.85, 1.24)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	0.77 (0.52, 1.14) 1.23 (0.52, 2.89) 0.82 (0.58, 1.16)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	1.31 (1.15, 1.49) 1.18 (0.91, 1.53) 1.28 (1.14, 1.44)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	_	1.30 (0.52, 3.27) 0.64 (0.24, 1.73) 0.96 (0.49, 1.86)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.43 (0.20, 10.31) 0.42 (0.14, 1.28) 0.65 (0.25, 1.66)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.69 (0.11, 4.38) 1.29 (0.98, 1.71) 1.28 (0.97, 1.68)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 0.90 (0.55, 1.46) 1.01 (0.68, 1.50)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	1.61 (1.08, 2.40) 1.61 (1.24, 2.09) 1.59 (1.28, 1.98)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	_ + _	1.19 (0.60, 2.37)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytoc Direct Indirect Network	in	0.36 (0.11, 1.23) 2.49 (0.58, 10.64) 0.80 (0.32, 2.05)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network		0.79 (0.53, 1.18)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.25 (1.00, 1.55)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	-	0.93 (0.47, 1.86)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	-+-	0.63 (0.24, 1.64)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.85 (1.03, 3.33) 1.46 (0.91, 2.34) 1.57 (1.10, 2.25)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ +	1.18 (0.56, 2.48)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytoci Network	in	0.79 (0.29, 2.16)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		1.25 (0.45, 3.48) 0.28 (0.08, 0.96) 0.75 (0.39, 1.46)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.30 (0.11, 0.87) 0.51 (0.20, 1.30)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.37 (0.10, 1.28) 0.68 (0.22, 207)

.

Figure 6. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by mode of birth (vaginal birth). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 7. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by mode of birth (caesarean section). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 8. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by mode of birth (caesarean section).

Comparison		RR (95% Cl)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	-	0.48 (0.17, 1.40)
Indirect		2.66 (0.35, 20.34)
Network	+	0.79 (0.31, 1.99)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	*	0.75 (0.30, 1.85)
Indirect	•	0.14 (0.01, 1.33)
Network		0.54 (0.22, 1.36)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network		0.55 (0.21, 1.44)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network	+	0.87 (0.34, 2.24)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	•	0.71 (0.47, 1.07)
Indirect	-	0.34 (0.11, 1.03)
Network	•	0.69 (0.50, 0.96)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	•	0.69 (0.51, 0.92)
Indirect <	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1.60 (0.00, 1.43e+16)
Network	•	0.69 (0.52, 0.92)
Misserentel vo Outopin		
Direct		1 07 (0 02 1 25)
Indirect	I.	1.07 (0.92, 1.23)
Network	T	2.33 (0.39, 9.33)
Network	Ť	1.10 (0.00, 1.39)
Misoprostol+Ovytocin vs. Carbetocin		
Network	1	1 00 (0 65 1 54)
Hervork	Ī	1.00 (0.00, 1.04)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		
Direct	•	2 31 (1 52 3 50)
Indirect	•	1 32 (0 86, 2 02)
Network	•	1.60 (1.10, 2.33)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxvtocin		
Network	•	1.59 (1.10, 2.30)
	1 1 10	

Figure 9. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by mode of birth (caesarean section). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 10. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by mode of birth (caesarean section). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 11. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by mode of birth (caesarean section).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Ergometrine+Oxytocinvs Oxytocin		
Network	+	2.35 (0.70, 7.85)
Carbatacia va Ovatacia		
Direct	•	0.62 (0.31, 1.23)
		0.19 (0.02 1.67)
Network	•	0.63 (0.37, 1.07)
		,
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	†	0.93 (0.70, 1.24)
Network	1	0.93 (0.70, 1.24)
Misoprostolys Oxytopin		
Direct	4	0.83 (0.54, 1.26)
Indirect -	_	1 97 (0 13 30 88)
Network	4	0.85 (0.56, 1.28)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Network	+-	4.16 (0.75, 23.06)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	•	0.07 (0.00, 0.70)
Indirect	·	0.27 (0.09, 0.76)
Network -	▲	0.73 (0.00, .)
		0.2. (0.00, 0.10)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Network	*	0.40 (0.12, 1.37)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	•	0.26 (0.40, 4.07)
Network	•	0.30 (0.10, 1.27)
Injectable practical and inclus Ergemetring + Owtooin		
Network		
Network	T•	1.77 (0.52, 5.97)
Misserestel, Ostasinus Carbatasin		
Network	A	1 40 (0 81 2 74)
Network	ľ	1.45 (0.01, 2.74)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		
Direct	↓ ↓ ↓	2.31 (0.62, 8.64)
Indirect	+	1.11 (0.52, 2.34)
Network	+	1.35 (0.70, 2.59)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin		6 64 (1 21 22 76)
Network		0.04 (1.51, 55.70)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	+	0.91 (0.55, 1.50)
		-
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	↓ •-	4.45 (0.78, 25.29)
Injectable practical and incurs Missersetal		
Network	 _	4 92 (0 85 28 35)
		4.02 (0.00, 20.00)
I	+	

.1 1 10

Figure 12. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by mode of birth (caesarean section). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 13. Network diagram for prevention of $PPH \ge 500 \text{ mL}$ by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (low risk). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 14. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (low risk).

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.74 (0.66, 0.83) 0.44 (0.23, 0.85) 0.57 (0.36, 0.89)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.41 (0.30, 0.56) 0.34 (0.16, 0.72) 0.37 (0.20, 0.66)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.48 (0.14, 1.68)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.65 (0.46, 0.91) 0.52 (0.29, 0.94) 0.56 (0.36, 0.88)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 1.02 (0.52, 2.00) 0.65 (0.35, 1.22)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 1.30 (0.46, 3.70) 0.96 (0.42, 2.20)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.81 (0.57, 1.13) 0.54 (0.27, 1.09) 0.65 (0.38, 1.09)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Network	0.84 (0.25, 2.87)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.03 (0.68, 1.56) 0.94 (0.48, 1.85) 0.99 (0.71, 1.39)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.59 (0.31, 7.99) 1.07 (0.56, 2.06) 1.15 (0.63, 2.10)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	2.44 (0.20, 30.37) 1.58 (0.53, 4.66) 1.70 (0.75, 3.84)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 1.32 (0.51, 3.40) 7.69 (0.00, .) 1.30 (0.43, 3.96)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	2.02 (1.30, 3.16) 1.20 (0.59, 2.43) 1.53 (0.91, 2.58)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	1.78 (0.86, 3.69)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	2.64 (1.06, 6.59)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	1.18 (0.35, 4.01)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	1.37 (0.36, 5.16)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	2.02 (0.48, 8.55)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	1.47 (0.55, 3.93) 0.45 (0.18, 1.13) 1.16 (0.67, 2.02)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	2.89 (0.46, 18.39) 1.11 (0.36, 3.47) 1.72 (0.78, 3.79)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	2.54 (0.25, 25.58) 1.09 (0.29, 4.06) 1.48 (0.64, 3.43)

.1 1 10

Figure 15. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (low risk). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 16. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (low risk). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 17. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (low risk).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.58 (0.48, 0.71) 0.51 (0.25, 1.05) 0.58 (0.48, 0.70)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	* *	0.66 (0.33, 1.32) 0.31 (0.13, 0.77) 0.50 (0.29, 0.87)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.35 (0.05, 2.38)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.59 (0.41, 0.87) 0.79 (0.42, 1.49) 0.64 (0.46, 0.89)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+- + +	0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.32 (0.09, 1.20) 0.22 (0.07, 0.68)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatme Direct Indirect Network	nt	0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 1.44 (0.25, 8.26) 0.94 (0.22, 4.01)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.49 (0.12, 1.95) 0.97 (0.52, 1.80) 0.87 (0.49, 1.52)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Network	_	0.60 (0.09, 4.12)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ +	1.35 (0.63, 2.90) 1.05 (0.70, 1.57) 1.11 (0.78, 1.58)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	3.00 (0.13, 71.70) 0.25 (0.07, 0.88) 0.38 (0.13, 1.17)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.43 (0.20, 10.31) 1.46 (0.11, 19.06) 1.62 (0.38, 6.92)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.69 (0.11, 4.38) 4.75 (0.00, .) 0.69 (0.11, 4.38)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	+ +	1.84 (0.60, 5.61) 1.11 (0.55, 2.24) 1.28 (0.71, 2.32)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	-	0.44 (0.13, 1.51)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocir Network		1.87 (0.40, 8.77)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	-	1.85 (0.27, 12.81)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network		0.64 (0.07, 5.87)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	_	2.70 (0.24, 29.92)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	→	0.34 (0.07, 1.66) 0.30 (0.06, 1.58) 0.35 (0.11, 1.05)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	 	5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.65 (0.09, 4.64) 1.46 (0.34, 6.34)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 2.30 (0.22, 23.73) 4.21 (0.77, 22.97)

Figure 18. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (low risk). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 19. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (high risk). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 20. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (high risk).

Companyon		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	↓	0.48 (0.17, 1.40) 2.80 (0.37, 21.38) 0.81 (0.32, 2.04)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	1.07 (0.20, 5.90)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	→	0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.13 (0.01, 1.26) 0.54 (0.21, 1.35)
Misoprostol+Oxytocinvs Placebo or no treatment Network	-	0.56 (0.22, 1.48)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.89 (0.34, 2.32)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	1.02 (0.30, 3.48)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatmen Network	t 📕	1.17 (0.18, 7.47)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Network	+	1.33 (0.31, 5.79)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	÷	0.67 (0.46, 0.98) 0.35 (0.11, 1.10) 0.67 (0.49, 0.91)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	0.70 (0.54, 0.91) 1.53 (0.00, 7.68e+15) 0.70 (0.54, 0.91)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.07 (0.92, 1.25) 2.18 (0.65, 7.30) 1.11 (0.88, 1.41)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.40 (0.71, 2.77) 0.55 (0.05, 6.30) 1.26 (0.56, 2.84)
Injectable prostaglandinsvs Oxytocin Network	 -	1.45 (0.28, 7.48)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	<u>↓</u> ↓	0.50 (0.13, 1.91) 0.55 (0.00, 2.28e+28) 0.50 (0.12, 2.10)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		0.53 (0.12, 2.33)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	0.83 (0.19, 3.67)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	0.95 (0.18, 5.06)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.09 (0.66, 1.81) 0.87 (0.00, .) 1.09 (0.53, 2.25)
Misoprostol+Oxytocinvs Carbetocin Network	+	1.05 (0.71, 1.57)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	•	2.31 (1.52, 3.50) 1.43 (0.94, 2.18) 1.67 (1.15, 2.41)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.90 (0.80, 4.49)
Injectable prostaglandinsvs Carbetocin Network		2.18 (0.44, 10.90)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	Ē.	1.58 (1.11, 2.26)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	•	1.58 (1.11, 2.26) 1.80 (0.77, 4.21)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	• •	1.58 (1.11, 2.26) 1.80 (0.77, 4.21) 2.07 (0.40, 10.88)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Difect Indirect Network	+ + -+- +	1.58 (1.11, 2.26) 1.80 (0.77, 4.21) 2.07 (0.40, 10.88) 0.50 (0.05, 5.34) 1.27 (0.52, 3.10) 1.14 (0.49, 2.62)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Difect Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Network	+ + -+ +	1.58 (1.11, 2.26) 1.80 (0.77, 4.21) 2.07 (0.40, 10.88) 0.50 (0.05, 5.34) 1.27 (0.52, 3.10) 1.14 (0.49, 2.62) 1.31 (0.25, 6.82)

.1 1 10

Figure 21. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (high risk). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 22. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (high risk). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 23. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (high risk).

Companison	_	KK (95% CI)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Network	+	2.31 (0.69, 7.69)
Carbetocin vs Oxvtocin		
Direct	•	0.63 (0.35 1.14)
Indirect	⊢	0 19 (0 02 1 66)
Network	•	0.62 (0.36, 1.05)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	+	0.90 (0.69, 1.19)
Network	+	0.90 (0.69, 1.19)
Misoprostol vs Oxvtocin		
Direct	4	0.83 (0.54, 1.26)
Indirect -		1 88 (0 12, 29 18)
Network	4	0.84 (0.56, 1.28)
njectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Network	+	0.84 (0.15, 4.65)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct	 ↓ 	0.27 (0.09, 0.78)
Indirect	*	0.44 (0.00, .)
Network -	•	0.27 (0.09, 0.78)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Network	+	0.39 (0.11, 1.35)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Ovytocin		
Network -	•	0.37 (0.10, 1.29)
Iniectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Ovytocin		
Direct	<u>_</u>	0.26 (0.11 1.22)
	`	0.30(0.11, 1.23)
Network -	•	0.36 (0.11, 1.23)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin		
Network	T	1.47 (0.81, 2.67)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		
Direct	T• -	2.31 (0.62, 8.64)
ndirect	Ť	1.13 (0.54, 2.38)
Network	Ť	1.37 (0.72, 2.62)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin		
Network	+	1.36 (0.27, 6.94)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	1	0.93 (0.57, 1.54)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	+	0.93 (0.16, 5.26)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol		
Network	+	0.99 (0.17, 5.73)

Figure 24. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by prior risk for postpartum haemorrhage (high risk). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 25. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by healthcare setting (hospital setting). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 26. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by healthcare setting (hospital setting).

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.54 (0.46, 0.63) 0.48 (0.33, 0.70) 0.51 (0.40, 0.65)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Difect Indirect Network	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.38 (0.28, 0.50)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.37 (0.28, 0.47) 0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.34 (0.24, 0.50)
Network	0.37 (0.26, 0.52)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment	0.36 (0.26, 0.49)
Indirect Network	0.60 (0.29, 1.25) 0.51 (0.38, 0.68) 0.55 (0.43, 0.71)
Indirect	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 0.66 (0.47, 0.93) 0.56 (0.41, 0.77)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 0.54 (0.35, 0.85) 0.55 (0.38, 0.82)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Difect Indirect Network	0.72 (0.57, 0.91) 0.72 (0.55, 0.94) 0.71 (0.59, 0.85)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect	0.75 (0.58, 0.98)
Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin	0.62 (0.32, 1.18) 0.73 (0.56, 0.94)
Direct + Indirect + Network +	0.71 (0.59, 0.85) 0.79 (0.35, 1.81) 0.70 (0.58, 0.86)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.08 (0.94, 1.24) 1.03 (0.75, 1.40) 1.08 (0.95, 1.22)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.31 (0.86, 1.99) 0.96 (0.69, 1.32) 1.09 (0.85, 1.40)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.84 (0.26, 2.71) 1.11 (0.74, 1.87)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	1.07 (0.74, 1.54)
Indirect Network	0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 1.03 (0.74, 1.42) 1.02 (0.75, 1.38)
Misoprostol+Uxytocin vs Ergometrine+Uxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.39 (0.65, 2.99) 0.91 (0.68, 1.22) 0.99 (0.76, 1.28)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.75 (1.35, 2.26) 1.34 (1.04, 1.72) 1.34 (1.04, 1.72)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Difect Indirect	0.17 (0.01, 4.06) 1.56 (1.17, 2.08)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	1.53 (1.15, 2.05)
Indirect Network	1.77 (1.06, 2.94) 1.50 (1.05, 2.15)
Network	0.97 (0.70, 1.34)
Indirect	2.31 (1.52, 3.50) 1.37 (1.02, 1.84)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin	1.48 (1.12, 1.96)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	1.00 (1.00, 2.14)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.93 (0.99, 3.76) 1.46 (1.14, 1.88)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	1.55 (1.22, 1.93)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	1.00 (1.13, 2.13)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	1.17 (0.77, 1.79) 0.78 (0.50, 1.14) 1.01 0.79 1.29
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol	1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.84 (0.55, 1.27)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	0.55 (0.69, 1.43) 1.42 (0.64, 3.17) 0.78 (0.48, 1.29) 0.58 (0.66, 1.46)
.1 1 1	10

Figure 27. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by healthcare setting (hospital setting). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 28. Network diagram for prevention of $PPH \ge 1000 \text{ mL}$ by healthcare setting (hospital setting). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 29. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by healthcare setting (hospital setting).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.64 (0.52, 0.79) 0.62 (0.44, 0.87) 0.63 (0.52, 0.78)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.54 (0.39, 0.74) 0.52 (0.39, 0.68)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	-	0.54 (0.36, 0.80)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	-	0.56 (0.41, 0.76)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.85 (0.63, 1.15) 0.68 (0.49, 0.95) 0.76 (0.60, 0.95)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.79 (0.37, 1.67) 0.62 (0.30, 1.24)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.58 (0.25, 1.32) 0.55 (0.25, 1.21)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.73 (0.57, 0.93) 1.05 (0.72, 1.52) 0.82 (0.65, 1.02)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.73 (0.45, 1.19) 0.30 (0.13, 0.72) 0.85 (0.59, 1.22)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.87 (0.69, 1.09) 1.16 (0.47, 2.91) 0.88 (0.69, 1.11)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	* * *	1.26 (1.11, 1.43) 1.32 (0.92, 1.89) 1.20 (1.00, 1.44)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	1.30 (0.52, 3.27) 0.63 (0.22, 1.82) 0.97 (0.49, 1.93)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.43 (0.20, 10.31) 0.72 (0.31, 1.70) 0.87 (0.40, 1.88)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 1.23 (0.91, 1.68) 1.04 (0.70, 1.53)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 1.03 (0.73, 1.47) 1.08 (0.78, 1.48)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	1.61 (1.08, 2.40) 1.40 (1.01, 1.94) 1.47 (1.14, 1.88)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		1.19 (0.58, 2.43)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.80 (0.17, 3.78) 2.36 (0.55, 10.19) 1.07 (0.50, 2.26)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.04 (0.68, 1.58)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network		2.31 (0.62, 8.64) 1.38 (1.00, 1.91) 1.41 (1.01, 1.97)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.15 (0.54, 2.45)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	_ 	1.03 (0.44, 2.38)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-+ +- +-	1.85 (1.03, 3.33) 1.26 (0.91, 1.74) 1.36 (1.03, 1.81)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ -	1.11 (0.54, 2.28)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ 	0.99 (0.45, 2.21)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		1.42 (0.47, 4.34) 0.29 (0.08, 1.04) 0.81 (0.41, 1.62)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.56 (0.24, 1.28) 0.73 (0.33, 1.58)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99,16) 0.62 (0.21, 1.84) 0.90 (0.33, 2.45)

.1 1 10

Figure 30. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by healthcare setting (hospital setting). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 31. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by healthcare setting (community setting). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 32. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by healthcare setting (community setting).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	•	0.64 (0.43, 0.95)
Network	•	0.65 (0.44, 0.95)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	•	0.73 (0.56, 0.96)
Indirect	-	→ 0.93 (0.00, .)
Network	•	0.73 (0.55, 0.97)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network	+	0.91 (0.22, 3.72)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin		
Network	•	1.13 (0.70, 1.81)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin		
Network	- - -	1.41 (0.33, 6.06)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		
Direct	-	1.25 (0.34, 4.63)
Indirect	•	→ 1.86 (0.00, .)
Network	+	1.25 (0.32, 4.96)
	1 1 10	

Figure 33. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by healthcare setting (community setting). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 34. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by healthcare setting (community setting). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.


Figure 35. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by healthcare setting (community setting).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatm	ient	
Direct	-	0.47 (0.22, 0.98)
Network	•	0.52 (0.38, 0.71)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no trea	atment	
Direct	•	0.59 (0.39, 0.88)
Indirect ←	•	→ 1.50 (0.00, .)
Network	•	0.61 (0.43, 0.85)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no tre	atment	
Network		0.20 (0.01, 5.04)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin		
Network	+	1.17 (0.74, 1.84)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin		
Network		0.39 (0.02, 9.83)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		
Direct		0.33 (0.01, 8.17)
Indirect	•	→ 2.04 (0.00, .)
Network	+	0.33 (0.01, 8.17)
Network		0.33 (0.01, 8.1
	.1 1 10	

Figure 36. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by healthcare setting (community setting). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 37. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a low dose (less or equal to 500 mcg). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 38. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a low dose (less or equal to 500 mcg).

Doption var Placebo or no treatment Detect Network E-ponethine-Oxylocin va Placebo or no treatment Detect Network Carbeton var Placebo or no treatment Detect Network Carbeton var Placebo or no treatment Network Networ	Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Expendition-Crystocin va Placobo or no treatment believe believe Christocin va Placobo or no treatment believe beli	Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+	0.61 (0.52, 0.71) 0.41 (0.29, 0.59) 0.54 (0.45, 0.65)
Carbedon vs Placebo or no treatment believed: Network:	Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.38 (0.29, 0.50) 0.38 (0.30, 0.48)
Network 0.00 (0.29, 0.54) Macgoratiol/Cyclon vs Pacebo or no treatment Network 0.05 (0.29, 0.50) Macgoratiol/Cyclon vs Pacebo or no treatment Defend 0.29, 0.44, 0.40, 0.29 Defend 0.29, 0.45, 0.45, 0.47, 0.47, 0.25 Defend 0.29, 0.45, 0.45, 0.45, 0.47, 0.45 Defend 0.29, 0.45,	Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect	+	0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.37 (0.27, 0.52)
Negretation vs Racebo or no treatment barden	Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.38 (0.29, 0.50)
Network 0.06 (0.5, 0.7) Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Defec	Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect		0.36 (0.14, 0.94) 0.58 (0.46, 0.73)
Network Networ	Network Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct	+	0.56 (0.45, 0.71)
higheable prostaglandine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct hariered Network Ergometrine-Oxytocin Direct Horizet Carbetoni vs Oxytocin Direct Network Carbetoni vs Oxytocin Direct Network Carbetoni vs Oxytocin Direct Network Direct	Indirect Network	-+	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 0.81 (0.58, 1.13) 0.64 (0.47, 0.88)
Equantine-Oxytocin VS (20, 57, 0, 91) Direct Market Network Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Magoratol-Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Magoratol-Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Magoratol-Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Magoratol-Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Magoratol-Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Magoratol-Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Network Hear on the set of	Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 0.56 (0.37, 0.84) 0.56 (0.38, 0.82)
Carbleoin vs Oxylocin Direct halirect Network Direct Direct balarect Direct balarect Direct balarect Network Misoprostol-Oxylocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Oxylocin Direct Network Network Direct	Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.72 (0.57, 0.91) 0.68 (0.52, 0.89) 0.70 (0.59, 0.83)
Mapprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Network Mesprostol vo Soytocin Direct Network Direct Network Ergometrine vo Soytocin Direct Network Infinect Network Ergometrine vo Soytocin Direct Infinect Network	Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.75 (0.58, 0.98) 0.57 (0.31, 1.06) 0.73 (0.58, 0.93)
Mapprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Network Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Indirect Indirect Network Indirect Indirect Network Indirect Indirect Indirect Network Indirect I	Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.71 (0.59, 0.85) 0.73 (0.33, 1.61) 0.71 (0.59, 0.85)
Ergometrine vs Dxytocin Direct Indirect Network Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Network Network Network Network Direct Indirect Network Netw	Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-	1.08 (0.95, 1.22) 0.89 (0.63, 1.24) 1.04 (0.90, 1.20)
hijectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Direct Network Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol-Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol-Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Net	Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.31 (0.86, 1.99) 1.03 (0.67, 1.57) 1.19 (0.90, 1.57)
Active of the second series of the second se	Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	_	0.84 (0.26, 2.71) 1.08 (0.73, 1.59) 1.03 (0.73, 1.47)
Network 1.55 (0.79, 1.39) Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.39 (0.65, 2.99) 0.94 (0.72, 1.24) Network 1.485 (1.33, 2.57) Infrect 1.485 (1.33, 2.57) Infrect 1.485 (1.32, 2.57) Infrect 1.49 (1.23, 1.80) Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.77 (1.00, 1, 4.06) 1.77 (1.00, 1, 4.06) 1.77 (1.00, 1, 4.06) 1.77 (1.02, 2.33) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.77 (1.06, 2.88) Network 0.96 (0.71, 1.30) Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network 1.48 (1.05, 2.09) Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network 1.42 (1.08, 1.85) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 1.42 (1.08, 1.85) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct 1.39 (0.99, 3.76) Infrect 1.42 (1.08, 1.85) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct 1.38 (1.08, 1.77) Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.44 (0.55, 1.53) Network 1.	Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 1.06 (0.79, 1.44)
Network 1.01 (0.79, 129) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network 1.485 (1.33, 2.57) 1.26 (0.97, 1.63) Network 1.49 (1.23, 1.80) Direct Indirect Network 1.77 (1.27, 2.38) Network 1.77 (1.27, 2.38) Network 1.77 (1.27, 2.38) Network 1.77 (1.27, 2.38) Network 1.48 (1.05, 2.09) Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network 0.96 (0.71, 1.30) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network 1.48 (1.05, 2.09) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network 1.42 (1.08, 1.85) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 1.42 (1.08, 1.85) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 1.42 (1.08, 1.85) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 1.41 (0.93, 2.14) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network 1.41 (0.93, 2.14) Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect 1.33 (1.02, 2.35) Indirect 1.43 (1.02, 2.35) Indirect 1.44 (0.99, 3.76) Indirect 1.44 (0.99, 3.76) Indirect 1.44 (0.99, 3.77) Indirect 1.44 (0.99, 3.77) Indirect 1.44 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network 1.44 (0.99, 3.77) Indirect 1.44 (0.89, 3.79) Indirect 1	Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	Į.	1.39 (0.65, 2.99) 0.94 (0.72, 1.24)
Network Frometrine vs Brgometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Indire	Network Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	+	1.01 (0.79, 1.29) 1.85 (1.33, 2.57) 1.26 (0.97, 1.63)
In the set	Network Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	+ +	1.49 (1.23, 1.80) 0.17 (0.01, 4.06)
Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Indirect Network Indirect Network Indirect Network Indirect Indirect Network Indirect Indirect Indirect Indirect Network Indirect I	noneca Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	÷	1.70 (1.24, 2.33)
Misoprostol-Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network 0.96 (0.71, 1.30) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network 1.42 (1.52, 3.50) Indirect Network 1.42 (1.12, 2.34) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 1.41 (0.93, 2.14) Misoprostol vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network 1.43 (0.99, 3.76) Indirect Network 1.43 (1.08, 1.77) Network 1.43 (1.08, 1.77) Hetwork 1.45 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Indirect 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Indirect 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Indirect 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Indirect 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) Indirect 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) Network 0.99 (0.69, 1.42) Indirect 0.93 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect 0.93 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) Network 0.99 (0.69, 1.42)	Direct Indirect Network	÷	1.29 (0.92, 1.79) 1.75 (1.06, 2.88) 1.48 (1.05, 2.09)
Direct Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network I.62 (1.12, 2.34) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network I.62 (1.12, 2.34) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network I.33 (0.99, 3.76) I.33 (0.99, 3.76) I.33 (0.99, 3.76) I.33 (1.06, 1.77) Network I.65 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network I.66 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network I.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct I.34 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect I.34 (0.66, 2.72) Infertoch Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct I.34 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect I.34 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect I.34 (0.66, 2.72) Infertoch Network	Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network Misoprostol vs Carbetocin	+	0.96 (0.71, 1.30)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 1.62 (1.12, 2.34) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 1.41 (0.93, 2.14) Misoprostol vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Direct 1.38 (1.08, 1.77) Network 1.63 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.68 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Indirect 1.34 (0.66, 2.72) Direct 1.34 (0.66, 2.72) Network 0.99 (0.69, 1.42) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 1.42 (0.64, 3.17)	Direct Indirect Network	-+ + +	2.31 (1.52, 3.50) 1.27 (0.96, 1.69) 1.42 (1.08, 1.85)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirec	Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.62 (1.12, 2.34)
Direct 1.93 (0.99, 3.76) Indirect 1.38 (1.08, 1.77) Network 1.47 (1.17, 1.84) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol-Oxytocin • Network 1.68 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol • Direct 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Indirect 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Direct 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Direct 1.34 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) Network 0.99 (0.59, 1.42) Indirect 0.99 (0.59, 1.42) Direct 1.34 (0.66, 2.72) Direct 0.99 (0.59, 1.42)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network Misoprostol vs Misoprostol=Ovutocin	+-	1.41 (0.93, 2.14)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network 1.68 (1.20, 2.35) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network 1.46 (0.99, 2.17) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Indirect 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Indirect 1.14 (0.85, 1.53) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 1.34 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) Network 0.99 (0.69, 1.42) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 1.42 (0.64, 3.17)	Indirect Network	÷	1.93 (0.99, 3.76) 1.38 (1.08, 1.77) 1.47 (1.17, 1.84)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Dir	Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	+	1.68 (1.20, 2.35)
Direct 1.84 (0.89, 3.79) Indirect 0.73 (0.50, 1.08) Network 1.14 (0.05, 1.53) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol 1.34 (0.66, 2.72) Indirect 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) Network 0.99 (0.69, 1.42) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine 1.42 (0.64, 3.17)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Fragmetrine vs Misoprostol	 •-	1.46 (0.99, 2.17)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine	Indirect Network	-+	1.84 (0.89, 3.79) 0.73 (0.50, 1.08) 1.14 (0.85, 1.53)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 1.42 (0.64, 3.17)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	Ļ.	1.34 (0.66, 2.72) 0.93 (0.62, 1.39) 0.99 (0.69, 1.42)
Indirect 0.66 (0.40, 1.10)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect		1.42 (0.64, 3.17) 0.66 (0.40, 1.10)

Figure 39. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a low dose (less or equal to 500 mcg). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 40. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a low dose (less or equal to 500 mcg). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 41. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a low dose (less or equal to 500 mcg). Figure 66. Figure

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	* *	0.61 (0.51, 0.72) 0.55 (0.37, 0.81) 0.60 (0.51, 0.70)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.49 (0.37, 0.65) 0.48 (0.38, 0.62)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.56 (0.34, 0.93)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.52 (0.40, 0.68)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	_+ _+ +	0.65 (0.42, 1.01) 0.65 (0.50, 0.86) 0.65 (0.52, 0.82)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	• 	0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.74 (0.33, 1.65) 0.56 (0.27, 1.18)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.50 (0.22, 1.12) 0.48 (0.22, 1.05)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.73 (0.57, 0.93) 1.02 (0.70, 1.48) 0.81 (0.66, 1.00)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.73 (0.45, 1.19) 0.28 (0.12, 0.67) 0.94 (0.57, 1.54)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.87 (0.69, 1.09) 0.99 (0.40, 2.45) 0.87 (0.70, 1.09)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	1.03 (0.81, 1.31) 1.21 (0.84, 1.76) 1.09 (0.89, 1.32)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.30 (0.52, 3.27) 0.45 (0.12, 1.67) 0.94 (0.45, 1.96)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.43 (0.20, 10.31) 0.69 (0.30, 1.61) 0.81 (0.37, 1.74)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 1.29 (0.98, 1.70) 1.16 (0.70, 1.90)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 ≠	1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 1.04 (0.75, 1.45) 1.08 (0.80, 1.45)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	- - - +- +	1.62 (1.06, 2.46) 1.20 (0.87, 1.67) 1.34 (1.04, 1.73)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	_ +	1.16 (0.54, 2.48)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.80 (0.17, 3.78) 2.00 (0.42, 9.53) 0.99 (0.47, 2.11)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	4	0.93 (0.55, 1.59)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	 _┿_	2.31 (0.62, 8.64) 1.12 (0.86, 1.46) 1.16 (0.69, 1.95)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	_ _	1.00 (0.42, 2.42)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	_ -	0.86 (0.35, 2.13)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	_← +	1.85 (1.03, 3.33) 1.10 (0.80, 1.53) 1.25 (0.94, 1.66)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	—	1.08 (0.50, 2.32)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ _	0.92 (0.42, 2.05)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		1.93 (0.34, 10.85) 0.33 (0.10, 1.14) 0.87 (0.41, 1.83)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Network	_	0.74 (0.34, 1.63)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.62 (0.20, 1.88) 0.86 (0.30, 2.41)
	,	
	1 1 10	

Figure 42. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a low dose (less or equal to 500 mcg). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 43. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a high dose (600 mcg or more). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 44. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH ≥ 500 restricted to misoprostol studies that use a high dose (600 mcg or more).

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.61 (0.52, 0.71) 0.57 (0.43, 0.76) 0.59 (0.49, 0.70)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct +- Indirect +- Network +-	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.45 (0.34, 0.59) 0.42 (0.33, 0.53)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.42 (0.30, 0.58) 0.44 (0.32, 0.60)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network -	0.42 (0.32, 0.55)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct + Indirect + Network +	0.78 (0.62, 0.97) 0.57 (0.43, 0.74) 0.65 (0.53, 0.80)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 0.64 (0.47, 0.87) 0.56 (0.42, 0.75)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 0.59 (0.39, 0.91) 0.59 (0.39, 0.87)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct	0.72 (0.57, 0.91) 0.72 (0.53, 0.98) 0.72 (0.59, 0.87)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.75 (0.58, 0.98) 0.76 (0.35, 1.65) 0.75 (0.58, 0.97)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.71 (0.59, 0.85) 1.87 (0.61, 5.73) 0.72 (0.59, 0.87)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.10 (0.85, 1.43) 1.18 (0.88, 1.58) 1.11 (0.95, 1.31)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.31 (0.86, 1.99) 0.73 (0.52, 1.03) 0.95 (0.73, 1.23)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.84 (0.26, 2.71) 1.02 (0.66, 1.57) 1.00 (0.69, 1.46)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 1.05 (0.76, 1.47) 1.04 (0.77, 1.42)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.39 (0.65, 2.99) 0.92 (0.68, 1.24) 1.00 (0.76, 1.30)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.40 (0.97, 2.02) 1.57 (1.22, 2.01) 1.55 (1.23, 1.95)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.17 (0.01, 4.06) 1.34 (0.99, 1.83) 1.32 (0.97, 1.79)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.29 (0.92, 1.79) 1.56 (0.89, 2.73) 1.39 (0.96, 2.02)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	0.96 (0.70, 1.32)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	1.49 (1.10, 2.00)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	1.27 (0.88, 1.82)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	1.33 (0.85, 2.10)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	1.55 (1.20, 2.00)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	1.32 (0.95, 1.83)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	1.39 (0.91, 2.13)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	0.88 (0.66, 1.16) 0.84 (0.58, 1.21) 0.85 (0.65, 1.11)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	13.00 (0.77, 219.11) 0.81 (0.54, 1.20) 0.90 (0.61, 1.34)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	1.42 (0.64, 3.17) 0.86 (0.51, 1.44) 1.05 (0.70, 1.59)

Figure 45. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a high dose (600 mcg or more). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 46. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a high dose (600 mcg or more). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 47. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a high dose (600 mcg or more).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.61 (0.51, 0.72) 0.55 (0.39, 0.78) 0.59 (0.50, 0.71)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	 	0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.49 (0.35, 0.68) 0.48 (0.36, 0.63)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_	0.50 (0.33, 0.77)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.53 (0.39, 0.71)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect	-+ -+	0.76 (0.51, 1.14) 0.65 (0.43, 1.01)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect	·	0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.63 (0.28, 1.38)
Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatmeni		0.49 (0.23, 1.03)
Direct — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — — —		0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.53 (0.23, 1.21) 0.51 (0.23, 1.12)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ _+ +	0.73 (0.57, 0.93) 1.12 (0.73, 1.72) 0.81 (0.63, 1.03)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.73 (0.45, 1.19) 0.26 (0.10, 0.68) 0.85 (0.56, 1.29)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.87 (0.69, 1.09) 3.00 (0.76, 11.92 0.89 (0 70 1 13)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect	+ +	1.14 (0.83, 1.58) 1.21 (0.83, 1.74) 1.22 (0.83, 1.74)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect		1.30 (0.52, 3.27) 0.38 (0.11, 1.28)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect		1.43 (0.20, 10.31 0.72 (0.30, 1.70)
Network Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		0.86 (0.40, 1.87) 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) 1.29 (0.98, 1.71)
Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	+	1.05 (0.67, 1.64)
Direct Indirect Network	*	1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 1.05 (0.73, 1.52) 1.10 (0.79, 1.53)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.43 (0.43, 4.80) 1.53 (1.11, 2.12) 1.53 (1.12, 2.09)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		1.02 (0.48, 2.19)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		0.80 (0.17, 3.78) 2.39 (0.55, 10.35
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	-	1.07 (0.50, 2.27)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network		1.46 (1.00, 2.12)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	<u> </u>	0.98 (0.43, 2.22)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	<u> </u>	1.02 (0.43, 2.43)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	+	1.39 (1.00, 1.94)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ _	0.93 (0.43, 2.00)
lnjectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ _	0.97 (0.44, 2.17)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		0.67 (0.14, 3.09) 0.66 (0.28, 1.57) 0.67 (0.32, 1.41)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct	•	5.00 (0.25, 99.16 0.53 (0.23, 1.24)
Indirect Network		

Figure 48. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to misoprostol studies that use a high dose (600 mcg or more). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 49. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intramuscular or intravenous bolus of any dose. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 50. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intramuscular or intravenous bolus of any dose.

+++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++ ++	$\begin{array}{c} 0.61 \ (0.52 \ 0.71) \\ 0.56 \ (0.41 \ 0.77) \\ 0.58 \ (0.47 \ 0.71) \\ \hline \\ 0.37 \ (0.30 \ 0.46) \\ 0.41 \ (0.31 \ 0.55) \\ 0.40 \ (0.31 \ 0.55) \\ 0.40 \ (0.31 \ 0.55) \\ 0.41 \ (0.27 \ 0.61) \\ 0.44 \ (0.30 \ 0.63) \\ \hline \\ 0.75 \ (0.59 \ 0.94) \\ 0.56 \ (0.43 \ 0.74) \\ 0.62 \ (0.50 \ 0.77) \\ \hline \end{array}$
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	$\begin{array}{c} 0.56 \ (0.41 \ , 0.77) \\ 0.58 \ (0.47 \ , 0.71) \\ \hline \\ 0.37 \ (0.30 \ , 0.46) \\ 0.41 \ (0.31 \ , 0.55) \\ 0.40 \ (0.31 \ , 0.52) \\ \hline \\ 0.75 \ (0.30 \ , 1.85) \\ 0.41 \ (0.27 \ , 0.61) \\ 0.41 \ (0.27 \ , 0.61) \\ 0.44 \ (0.30 \ , 0.63) \\ \hline \\ 0.75 \ (0.59 \ , 0.94) \\ 0.56 \ (0.43 \ , 0.74) \\ 0.62 \ (0.50 \ , 0.77) \end{array}$
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	0.58 (0.47, 0.71) 0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.41 (0.31, 0.55) 0.40 (0.31, 0.52) 0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.41 (0.31, 0.55) 0.40 (0.31, 0.52) 0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	$\begin{array}{c} 0.37 \ (0.30, 0.46) \\ 0.41 \ (0.31, 0.55) \\ 0.40 \ (0.31, 0.52) \\ \end{array}$
∓ + + + + + +	0.41 (0.31, 0.55) 0.40 (0.31, 0.52) 0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
	0.40 (0.31, 0.52) 0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
 + + + + + + + + + + + +	0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
-+ + + + + + + + + + + + + + +	0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
+ + + + + +	0.41 (0.27, 0.61) 0.44 (0.30, 0.63) 0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
+ + + +	0.75 (0.59, 0.54) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
+ + + - +	0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
+ + + - +	0.75 (0.59, 0.94) 0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
+ - +	0.56 (0.43, 0.74) 0.62 (0.50, 0.77)
- +	0.02 (0.00, 0.11)
- +	
- -	
+	0.24 (0.14, 0.42)
	0.62 (0.46, 0.84)
1	
	0.55 (0.22, 1.35)
—	0.62 (0.40, 0.96)
—	0.79 (0.61, 1.03)
÷	0.03 (0.49, 0.00) 0.70 (0.57, 0.86)
ام	
_ _	0.93 (0.71, 1.22)
	0.75 (0.54, 1.05)
Ŧ	1.05 (0.84, 1.30)
	1.07 (0.92, 1.25)
—	1.26 (0.74, 2.13) 0.98 (0.70, 1.38)
+	1.08 (0.82, 1.41)
	0.04 (0.00, 0.74)
	0.84 (0.26, 2.71)
- - -	1.05 (0.71, 1.56)
	0.05 (0.44.2.00)
	0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 1.11 (0.74, 1.66)
-	1.08 (0.75, 1.56)
-	1 75 (1 35 2 26)
•	1.35 (1.02, 1.80)
+	1.54 (1.25, 1.89)
	0 17 (0 01 4 06)
-	1.57 (1.15, 2.15)
	1.54 (1.13, 2.10)
	1 29 /0 92 1 79\
⊢⊷_	1.77 (1.04, 3.01)
-	1.51 (1.03, 2.22)
	2.31 (1.52, 3.50)
+ •-	1.25 (0.86, 1.83)
+	1.42 (1.01, 2.01)
	1.43 (0.94, 2.16)
1	
	1.40 (0.85, 2.30)
+	1.40 (0.85, 2.30)
↓ →	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75)
+- +-	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10)
	1.40 (0.85,2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30)
	1.40 (0.85,2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30)
+- +- +- +	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30) 1.60 (0.57, 4.52)
	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30) 1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.82 (0.52, 1.27)
	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30) 1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.82 (0.52, 1.27) 0.98 (0.67, 1.45)
	1.40 (0.85,2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30) 1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.82 (0.52, 1.27) 0.98 (0.67, 1.45)
	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30) 1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.82 (0.52, 1.27) 0.98 (0.67, 1.45) 1.42 (0.64, 3.17)
	1.40 (0.85, 2.30) 1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.71 (0.46, 1.10) 1.00 (0.77, 1.30) 1.60 (0.57, 4.52) 0.82 (0.52, 1.27) 0.98 (0.67, 1.45) 1.42 (0.84, 3.17) 0.77 (0.46, 1.30)
-	

Figure 51. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intramuscular or intravenous bolus of any dose. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 52. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intramuscular or intravenous bolus of any dose. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 53. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH ≥ 1000 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intramuscular or intravenous bolus of any dose.

		RR (95% CI)
Dxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	+	0.61 (0.51, 0.72)
ndirect	+	0.50 (0.39, 0.65)
letwork	•	0.57 (0.50, 0.66)
rgometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct		0.44 (0.18, 1.05)
ndirect letwork	±	0.50 (0.39, 0.65)
IGIWOIK	•	0.50 (0.55, 0.65)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
letwork	-	0.56 (0.44, 0.69)
Assoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	-	0.73 (0.56, 0.95)
ndirect	+	0.78 (0.63, 0.96)
letwork	•	0.76 (0.65, 0.88)
roometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		
)irect	<u> </u>	0.09 (0.01, 0.72)
ndirect		0.78 (0.36, 1.67)
letwork		0.60 (0.29, 1.23)
niectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	-	0.36 (0.04, 3.24)
ndirect		0.55 (0.25, 1.21)
ICIWUI K		0.53 (0.25, 1.13)
rgometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
lirect	-	0.80 (0.61, 1.06)
idirect	1	0.97 (0.70, 1.34)
IELWOIK		0.87 (0.70, 1.07)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	. +	1.02 (0.86, 1.22)
ndirect	→	0.35 (0.16, 0.77)
IGLIVIUN	T	0.97 (0.82, 1.16)
lisoprostol vs Oxytocin		
Direct	+	1.35 (1.17, 1.55)
ndirect	1 •	1.25 (0.97, 1.60)
Network	•	1.32 (1.17, 1.49)
rgometrine vs Oxytocin		
lirect		1.52 (0.47, 4.92)
ndirect		0.79 (0.31, 2.01)
Network		1.05 (0.51, 2.13)
njectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Direct	•	1.43 (0.20, 10.31)
ndirect		0.78 (0.34, 1.80)
VELWOIN	•	0.82 (0.43, 1.80)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct	.	0.34 (0.13, 0.86)
ndirect	—	1.24 (0.94, 1.64)
GLAADIK	•	1.12 (0.00, 1.40)
lisoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct		1.60 (1.07, 2.37)
Indirect	Ŧ	1.49 (1.09, 2.04)
CLADIN .	-	1.55 (1.25, 1.50)
rgometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
letwork	- _	1.21 (0.58, 2.52)
visatable, prostaglanding va Fragmatring (Overtagin		
Direct	•	0.80 (0.17.3.78)
ndirect		2.36 (0.55, 10.09)
letwork		1.06 (0.51, 2.23)
lizoprostol ve Carbetocin		
insoprosion vs carbelocin)irect	_	2 31 (0 62 8 64)
ndirect	+	1.34 (1.09, 1.66)
letwork	+	1.36 (1.10, 1.68)
raomatrina ve Carbatocia		
letwork		1.08 (0.52.2.24)
njectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin		
letwork	-	0.95 (0.44, 2.06)
rgometrine vs Misoprostol		
Direct		1.25 (0.45, 3.48)
ndirect	•	0.28 (0.07, 1.09)
letwork		0.79 (0.39, 1.61)
niectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol		
Direct		> 5.00 (0.25, 99.16)
ndirect		0.54 (0.24, 1.21)
letwork		0.70 (0.33, 1.49)
niectable prostanlandins vs Froometrine		
njectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine virect		5.00 (0.25, 99.16)
njectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Virect Idirect		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.61 (0.20, 1.81)
njectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Nirect didrect letwork		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.61 (0.20, 1.81) 0.88 (0.32, 2.41)

Figure 54. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intramuscular or intravenous bolus of any dose. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 55. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous bolus plus an infusion of any dose. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 56. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous bolus plus an infusion of any dose.

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_ -	0.52 (0.24, 1.12)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.40 (0.26, 0.60) 0.39 (0.28, 0.54)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct Indirect		0.75 (0.30, 1.85) 0.31 (0.16, 0.58)
Network	—	0.38 (0.22, 0.67)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct	+	0.75 (0.59, 0.94)
Indirect Network		0.52 (0.33, 0.82) 0.63 (0.47, 0.84)
Froometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	→	0.24 (0.14, 0.42)
Network	~	0.61 (0.41, 0.89)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct		0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 0.66 (0.39, 1.13)
Network		0.64 (0.40, 1.03)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Network		0.74 (0.35, 1.59)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct	—	0.60 (0.38, 0.95)
Indirect Network	·	1.95 (0.27, 14.10) 0.73 (0.34, 1.56)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocio		
Direct	•	1.39 (1.01, 1.92)
Network	·	1.21 (0.58, 2.52)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Network	_ -	1.16 (0.53, 2.56)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network	_ -	1.23 (0.53, 2.86)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct Indirect		0.96 (0.44, 2.09) 1.00 (0.48, 2.08)
Network	-	0.98 (0.57, 1.71)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	+	1 75 (1 35 2 26)
Indirect		1.34 (0.81, 2.21)
	-	1.65 (1.25, 2.15)
Direct		0.17 (0.01, 4.06)
Indirect Network	→	1.62 (1.10, 2.38) 1.57 (1.07, 2.30)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct Indirect	↓	1.29 (0.92, 1.79) 2.22 (1.18, 4.18)
Network	-	1.65 (1.07, 2.56)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct		2 31 (1 52 3 50)
Indirect Network		1.28 (0.63, 2.64)
		1.00 (0.50, 2.00)
Ergometrine VS Cardetocin Network		1.59 (0.86, 2.95)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network		1.68 (0.86, 3.29)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct	_	1.18 (0.79, 1.75)
Indirect Network	↓	0.32 (0.17, 0.61) 0.96 (0.71, 1.30)
Injectable prostanlandins vs Misoprostol		
Direct	•	1.60 (0.57, 4.52)
Network	—	1.01 (0.65, 1.59)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine		
Direct Indirect		1.42 (0.64, 3.17) 0.83 (0.45, 1.56)
Network	+	1.06 (0.65, 1.72)
	.1 1 10	

Figure 57. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 500 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous bolus plus an infusion of any dose. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 58. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous bolus plus an infusion of any dose. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 59. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous bolus plus an infusion of any dose.

Dxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	
Vetwork	0.46 (0.15, 1.41)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	
Jirect	0.44 (0.18, 1.05)
ndirect	0.48 (0.29, 0.78)
VELWUIK	0.47 (0.33, 0.08)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.20 (0.09, 0.46)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment	
Direct -	0.73 (0.56, 0.95)
ndirect	0.54 (0.27, 1.10)
verwork	0.71 (0.55, 0.90)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment	0.09 (0.01.0.72)
ndirect	0.76 (0.29, 1.99)
Network	0.52 (0.22, 1.25)
njectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment	
Direct	0.36 (0.04, 3.24)
ndirect	0.50 (0.20, 1.22)
Network	0.48 (0.21, 1.09)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin	
Vetwork	1.03 (0.33, 3.16)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin	0.50 /0.44 0.000
ndirect	0.59 (0.14, 2.38)
Vetwork	0.10 (0.01, 2.00) 0.44 (0.13, 1.47)
	0.14 (0.10, 1.47)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin	4 95 /0 45 4 40
Direct	1.35 (0.45, 4.10)
Network	1.54 (0.51, 4.59)
Vetwork	1.14 (0.28, 4.55)
niectable prostanlandine ve Ovutocin	
Vetwork	1.04 (0.27, 4.04)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	
Direct	0.34 (0.13, 0.86)
ndirect	0.67 (0.17, 2.67)
Vetwork	0.42 (0.19, 0.93)
Nisoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	
Direct	1.61 (1.08, 2.40)
	1.29 (0.71, 2.37)
vetwork	1.50 (1.07, 2.09)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	1.11 (0.45.2.74)
njectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	0.80 (0.17.3.78)
ndirect	2.25 (0.44, 11.55)
Network	1.01 (0.47, 2.21)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin	
Direct	2.31 (0.62, 8.64)
nairect	4.47 (1.62, 12.36)
	0.02 (1.00, 1.04)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	2.61 (0.81, 8.43)
njectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin	
Network +	2.38 (0.80, 7.15)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol	
Direct	1.25 (0.45, 3.48)
ndirect	0.09 (0.01, 0.59)
	0.74 (0.52, 1.74)
njectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol	E 00 /0 25 00 401
ndirect	0.53 (0.23, 49.16)
Vetwork	0.68 (0.30, 1.54)
niectable prostaolandins vs Eroometrine	
Direct	5.00 (0.25, 99.16)
ndirect	0.62 (0.18, 2.12)
	0.01 (0.20.2.96)
Network	0.81 (0.28, 2.00)

Figure 60. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous bolus plus an infusion of any dose. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 61. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous infusion only of any dose. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 62. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous infusion only of any dose.

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.60 (0.45, 0.80)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	+	0.37 (0.30, 0.46)
Network	+	0.41 (0.29, 0.58) 0.40 (0.30, 0.51)
		,
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct		0.75 (0.30, 1.85)
Indirect	—	0.32 (0.21, 0.49)
Network	→	0.36 (0.24, 0.54)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	_ +	0.75 (0.59, 0.94)
Indirect Network		0.53 (0.37, 0.76) 0.65 (0.52, 0.82)
		0.00 (0.02, 0.02)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment	I	0.24 (0.44, 0.42)
Indirect	· •	0.78 (0.57, 1.07)
Network	-	0.63 (0.46, 0.87)
Injectable prostaglanding vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct		0.55 (0.22, 1.35)
Indirect	—	0.65 (0.42, 1.02)
Network		0.65 (0.42, 0.95)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin	-	0.54 (0.04.0.70)
Direct		0.51 (0.34, 0.76) 0.72 (0.52, 0.99)
Network	+	0.66 (0.51, 0.87)
Cash sha sin wa Ova ta sin		
Direct	-	0.58 (0.37, 0.89)
Indirect		0.64 (0.38, 1.08)
Network		0.61 (0.42, 0.87)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin		
Direct	_ _	1.08 (0.96, 1.21)
Network	+	1.10 (0.90, 1.33)
Former tailer and Oracle all		
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct	_	1.50 (0.74, 3.03)
Indirect	+	0.99 (0.70, 1.39)
Network	+	1.05 (0.77, 1.45)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Network	+	1.06 (0.70, 1.62)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct		0.96 (0.44, 2.09)
Indirect Network	-	0.91 (0.58, 1.41) 0.92 (0.62, 1.35)
		,
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	+	1 75 (1 35 2 26)
Indirect	-	1.50 (1.04, 2.15)
Network	+	1.65 (1.33, 2.04)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct C	• •	0.17 (0.01, 4.06)
Network		1.63 (1.16, 2.25) 1.59 (1.15, 2.19)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	.	1 29 (0 92 1 79)
Indirect	—	2.17 (1.24, 3.81)
Network	-•-	1.60 (1.10, 2.33)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		
Direct		2.31 (1.52, 3.50)
Indirect Network	—	1.62 (1.06, 2.49) 1.80 (1.26, 2.58)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin		1 73 (1 12 2 68)
HCLWOR .		1.13 (1.12, 2.00)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin	_	4 75 (4 05 0 80)
Network	-	1.75 (1.05, 2.89)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		
Direct	_ → ^T	1.18 (0.79, 1.75) 0.38 (0.22, 0.67)
Network	+	0.96 (0.74, 1.25)
Injectable prostaglandine vo Missorsatal		
Direct		1.60 (0.57, 4.52)
Indirect	-+ <u>+</u>	0.81 (0.53, 1.26)
Network	-	0.97 (0.66, 1.42)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine		
Direct		1.42 (0.64, 3.17)
Network	÷	0.62 (0.46, 1.39) 1.01 (0.66, 1.54)
1		
.1	1 10	

Figure 63. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous infusion only of any dose. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 64. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous infusion only of any dose. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 65. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous infusion only of any dose.

Drybole no treatment Helwork Confection va Placebo or no treatment Dred Dred Cableon va Placebo or no treatment Dred Dred Cableon va Placebo or no treatment Dred Dred Dred	Comparison		RR (95% CI)
trigonetrine-Oxylical va Placebo and treatment Universe Carbodic va Placebo and treatment Universe Uni	Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.81 (0.57, 1.15)
Decision Control Particulation on Calculation Decision of Particulation on Calculation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation of Particulation of Particulation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation of Particulation of Particulation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation of Particulation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Helevork Placebo or no treatment Decision of Particulation Decision of Particulation Decisi	Fragmetring, Ovatagin va Plagaba, or no tragtment		
hafeed hafeed Halvork Carbetch v Placebo or no treatment Helvork Carbetch v Placebo or no treatment Helvork Carbetch v Placebo or no treatment Deed	Direct	_ _	0.44 (0.18, 1.05)
Helwork Carbelcon va Pacebo or no treatment Freework Carbelcon va Pacebo or no treatment Dred Carbelcon va Plocobo or no treatment Carbelcon va Plocobo or no treatment Dred Carbelcon va Plocobo or no treatment Carbelcon va Plocobo or no treatment Carbelcon va Plocobo or no treatment Dred Carbelcon va Plocobo or no treatment Carbelcon va Daylocin Carbelcon va Daylocin Carbelcon va Daylocin Carbelcon va Daylocin Carbelcon va Carbelcon Dred Carbelcon va Ergometrine-Oxylocin Dred Carbelcon va Ergometrine-Oxylocin Dred Carbelcon va Ergometrine-Oxylocin Carbelcon va Ergometrine-Oxylocin Carbelcon va Ergometrine-Oxylocin Carbelcon va Ergometrine-Oxylocin Carbelcon va Carbelcon Helwork Carbelcon Carbelcon va Carbelcon Helwork Carbelcon va Carbelcon Helwor	Indirect	- - -	0.50 (0.33, 0.76)
Carbelion vs Pacebo or no treatment Velovit Vs Pacebo or no treatment Direct Vs Pacebo or no treatment Direct Vs Pacebo or no treatment Used Vs Vs Pacebo or no treatment Used Vs Vs Pacebo or no treatment Used Vs V	Network	→	0.48 (0.35, 0.67)
Mapproble vs Placebo or no breatment Drect Meterica Figumetrine vs Placebo or no breatment Drect Origination Figumetrine vs Placebo or no breatment Drect Origination Figumetrine Oxylocin Drect Origination Figumetrine Oxylocin Drect Origination Figumetrine vs Oxylocin Drect Orig	Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	—	0.19 (0.09, 0.38)
Direct 0.7 (2023, 05) Metervork 0.5 (0.23, 05) Direct 0.5 (0.04, 0.23, 05) Direct 0.5 (0.02, 0.5, 05) Direct 0	Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
Transmission of the second of	Direct		0.73 (0.56, 0.95)
Expenditive us Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect In	Network	+	0.56 (0.56, 0.62)
Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,02,1,72) highedble prostaglandina va Placebo or no treatment Direct 0,00 (0,02,1,72) highedble prostaglandina va Placebo or no treatment Direct 0,00 (0,02,1,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,02,1,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,02,1,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,01,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,02,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,02,01,02) Helwork 0,00 (0,02,01,02) Direct 0,00 (0,02,01,02)	Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		
hidrect 0.73 (0.31, 7.3) hijedable prostaglandina vs Placebo or no treatment Direct 0.58 (0.42, 3.0) hiedvork 0.59 (0.22, 1.09) hiedvork 0.59 (0.22, 1.09) hiedvork 0.59 (0.22, 1.09) Direct 0.59 (0.41, 0.59) Direct 0.59 (0.22, 1.59) Direct 0.59 (0.23, 1.59) Direct 0.50 (0.25, 59, 16) Direct 0.50 (0.25, 59, 16)	Direct		0.09 (0.01, 0.72)
hijedable prostaglandins va Placebo or no treatment Direct Mared Direct Di	Network		0.73 (0.31, 1.73) 0.54 (0.24, 1.19)
Direct Midrect Network Ergometrine-Oxylocin Direct Indirect Carbeloch vs Dxylocin Direct Carbeloch vs Dxylocin Direct Carbeloch vs Dxylocin Direct Direct Direct 0.49 (0.28, 0.87) 0.80 (0.48, 28) 0.48 (0.27, 1.09) 0.48 (0.27, 1.09) 0.48 (0.27, 1.09) 0.48 (0.27, 1.09) 0.49 (0.28, 0.87) 0.50 (0.14, 0.59) 0.50 (0.14, 0.59) 0.50 (0.14, 0.59) 0.50 (0.14, 0.59) Direct 0.57 (0.22, 145) 0.58 (0.86, 1.17) Ergometrine vs Dxylocin Direct 0.57 (0.22, 145) 0.58 (0.86, 1.17) Ergometrine vs Dxylocin Direct 0.57 (0.22, 145) 0.58 (0.30, 146) Direct 0.56 (0.30, 146) Direct 0.56 (0.30, 146) Direct 0.56 (0.30, 146) Direct 0.56 (0.30, 146) Direct 0.58 (0.19, 0.77) Materot Network 1.12 (0.49, 253) Network 1.12 (0.49, 253) 1.12 (0.41, 120) 1.12 (0.49, 254) 1.12 (0.49, 254) 1.12 (0.41, 120) 1.12 (0.41, 120) 1.12 (0	Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatme	int	
Instruct. Bergometrine+Oxytocin vo Dxytocin Direct	Direct		0.36 (0.04, 3.24)
Drect 0.49 (0.20, 0.67) Drect 0.49 (0.20, 0.67) Drect 0.49 (0.20, 0.67) Drect 0.54 (0.20, 0.67) Drect 0.55 (0.20, 0.10, 0.59) Drect 0.57 (0.20, 0.72) Drect 0.57 (0.20, 0.72) Drect 0.57 (0.22, 0.52) Drect 0.56 (0.20, 1.48) Drect 0.57 (0.22, 0.52) Drect 0.56 (0.20, 1.48) Drect 0.56 (0.20, 1.58) Carbetocin 0.57 (0.22, 0.52) Drect 0.58 (0.18, 0.57) Network 0.58 (0.18, 0.57) Drect 0.56 (0.20, 1.58) Drect 0.57 (0.22, 0.52) Drect 0.57 (0.22, 0.52) Drect 0.58 (0.18, 0.57) Drect 0.58 (0.18, 0.57) Drect 0.50 (0.25, 0.16)	Indirect		0.51 (0.21, 1.20) 0.48 (0.22, 1.08)
Ergometrine-Doytocin Volumetrine-Doytocin Volumetries		-	0.10 (0.22, 1.00)
Direct 0.49 (0.28, 0.67) Metwork 0.40 (0.28, 0.67) Direct 0.40 (0.28, 0.67) Direct 0.40 (0.28, 0.67) Direct 0.40 (0.28, 0.67) Direct 0.50 (0.66, 1.22) Direct 0.50 (0.22, 1.52) Direct 0.50 (0.25, 52) Direct 0.50 (0.5	Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
narect 0.64 (0.39, 1.07) Garbetoch vs Oxytocin Direct Direct Direct 0.77 (0.04, 0.72) Direct 0.50 (11, 0.58) Network 0.52 (0.11, 0.47) Masprostol vs Oxytocin Direct 0.57 (0.22, 1.52) Network 0.66 (0.30, 1.48) Network 0.66 (0.28, 1.36) Carbetoch vs Ergometrine-Oxytocin Direct 0.54 (0.18, 0.28) Network 0.56 (0.17, 73) Network 0.57 (0.22, 1.45) Network 0.56 (0.10, 1.25) Network 0.56 (0.17, 73) Network 0.56 (0.17, 74) Network 0.56	Direct		0.49 (0.28, 0.87)
Aretechi vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Mapprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Miscrostol vs Oxytocin Direct Miscrostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network Carbetocin Direct Miscrostol vs Crytocin Direct Miscrostol vs Crytocin Miscrostol vs Crytocin Miscrostol vs Crytocin Direct Miscrostol vs Crytocin Direct Miscrostol vs Crytocin Direct Miscrostol Direct Miscrost	Indirect		0.64 (0.39, 1.07)
Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Direct Direct Direct Miteret Network Ergometrine vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Ergometrine-Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Carbetoon vs Ergometrine-Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Network Network Network Network Carbetoon vs Oxytoon Direct Indirect Network Netw	NGLWUIK	- -	0.00 (0.41, 0.86)
Direct 0, 17 (0.04, 672) heliverk 0, 23 (0.11, 0.47) Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct 0, 25 (0.11, 0.50) Network 0, 23 (0.11, 0.47) Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct 0, 26 (1.22) heliverk 0, 28 (0.86, 1.77) Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct 0, 25 (1.22, 1.52) Direct 0, 26 (1.22) Direct 1, 25 (1.25) Direct 1, 25 (1.25) Direct 1, 26 (1.25) Direct 1, 27 (1.25) Direct 1, 28 (Carbetocin vs Oxytocin		
hdriect 0.25 (0.11, 0.59) Network 0.23 (0.11, 0.59) Direct 0.99 (0.66, 1.22) holicet 0.99 (0.66, 1.22) holicet 0.97 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) holicet 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) holicet 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) holicet 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) holicet 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) holicet 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.22, 1.45) Direct 0.95 (0.25, 1.35) Carbetoni vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.34 (0.15, 0.25) holicet 1.12 (0.42, 2.53) hijectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.95 (0.25, 0.45) holicet 0.14 (0.45, 0.25) holicet 0.15 (0.97, 72) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.26 (0.94, 7.22) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 0.55 (0.025, 99. 16) holicet 0.55 (0.025, 99. 16) holice	Direct		0.17 (0.04, 0.72)
Misoprostol vs Cxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Cxytocin Direct Misor Direct Misor Direct Misor Network Misoprostol vs Cxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network Misoprostol Direct Misoprostol Direct Misoprostol Direct Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network Misoprostol Direct Misoprostol Direct	Indirect		0.25 (0.11, 0.58)
Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Ergometrine -Oxytocin Direct Misporatol vs Ergometrine -Oxytocin Direct Misporatol vs Ergometrine -Oxytocin Direct Misporatol vs Ergometrine -Oxytocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Network Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol vs Carbetocin Direct Misporatol Direct Mis	NELWORK		v.∠3 (0.11, 0.47)
uncci hidract Network Carbetocin vs Ergometrine vo Skytocin Network Direct hidract Direct Direct hidract Direct hidract Direct hidract Direct	Misoprostol vs Oxytocin		0.00 (0.00 + 00)
All and a second	Direct		0.90 (0.66, 1.22)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Network hijectable prostaglandins vs Grybocin Direct Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network Direct	Network		0.87 (0.29, 1.52) 0.88 (0.66, 1.17)
Direct 100 (02, 2, 49) hdirect 0, 057 (0, 22, 49) hdirect 0, 050 (0, 26, 136) Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0, 04 (0, 13, 0, 86) hdirect 0, 03 (0, 19, 0, 77) higher bias prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0, 04 (0, 10, 0, 14) hdirect 0, 05 (0, 14, 02) hdirect 0, 05 (0, 14) hdirect 0, 05 (0, 05) hdirect 0, 05 (0, 14) hdirect 0, 05 (0, 05) hdirect 0, 0	Ergometrine vs Oxytocin		
hdrect 0.57 (0.22, 1.45) Network 0.66 (0.30, 1.48) hjectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network 0.60 (0.26, 1.36) Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.46 (0.16, 1.25) Network 0.38 (0.19, 0.77) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.31 (0.33, 2.05) Network 1.47 (1.09, 1.99) Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.88 (0.17, 3.78) Direct 0.88 (0.17, 3.78) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.19 (0.44, 1102) Direct 0.29 (1.03, 8.15) hipictable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) hipictable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) higircate 0.75 (0.35, 1.64) higicate prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.50 (0.25, 9.16) Direct 0.50 (0.25, 9.16	Direct		1.00 (0.22, 4.49)
Network 0.66 (0.30, 1.48) hijedable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) Our 45 (0.16, 1.25) Network 0.38 (0.19, 0.77) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.31 (0.82, 2.40) hidriect 1.47 (1.09, 1.99) Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.45 (1.06, 2.40) hidriect 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) hijectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.45 (2.40, 0.62) Network 2.31 (0.62, 8.64) hidriect 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) hijectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.41 (0.20) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.41 (0.30, 0.80) Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) hijectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) hidriect 0.36 (0.31, 1.51) hijectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) hidriect 0.36 (0.31, 1.51) hijectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.36 (0.31, 1.51) hijectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.36 (0.31, 1.51) hijectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.36 (0.31, 2.52) Hord 0.37, 2.62)	Indirect		0.57 (0.22, 1.45)
hječtable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network 0.60 (0.26, 1.36) Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.34 (0.13, 0.86) Network 0.38 (0.19, 0.77) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.51 (1.08, 2.40) Indirect 1.31 (0.83, 2.05) Network 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) hječtable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.50 (0.17, 378) Network 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) hječtable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.51 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 0.52 (0.44, 11.02) Network 2.53 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 0.52 (0.41, 0.62) Network 2.53 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 0.52 (0.41, 0.62) Network 2.53 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 0.52 (0.41, 0.62) Network 2.53 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 0.52 (0.45, 3.48) Indirect 0.52 (0.45, 3.48) Indirect 0.55 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 0.55 (0.62, 9.16) Direct 0.55 (0.62, 9.16	Network		0.66 (0.30, 1.48)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Direct	Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network		0.60 (0.26, 1.36)
Direct 0.44 (0.13, 0.86) hdirect 0.45 (0.16, 1.25) Network 0.38 (0.19, 0.77) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.47 (1.09, 1.39) Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.80 (0.17, 3.78) 1.47 (1.09, 1.39) Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.80 (0.17, 3.78) 2.19 (0.44, 11.02) Network 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct 2.31 (0.62, 8.64) 1.65 (2.04, 10.62) Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostagiandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostagiandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostagiandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.46 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostagiandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.50 (0.25, 99.16) Injectable prostagiandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.50 (0.25, 99.16) Injectable prostagiandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.50 (0.25, 99.16) Injectable prostagiandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.50 (0.25, 99.16) Injectable prostagiandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.50 (0.25, 99.16) Direct 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.50 (0.25, 99.16) Direct 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Direct 0.63 (0.20, 2	Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
hdirect 0.45 (0.16, 1.25) 0.38 (0.19, 0.77) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) Network 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.88 (0.17, 3.78) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct 2.31 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 3.32 (1.90, 7.69) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.61 (0.94, 7.22) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) Indirect 3.000 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 3.000	Direct	<u>→</u>	0.34 (0.13, 0.86)
Network 0.38 (0.19, 0.77) Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Indirect Indirect Direct Indire	Indirect		0.45 (0.16, 1.25)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vo Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Indirect Network Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine Network Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	Network	_ -	0.38 (0.19, 0.77)
Direct 1.61 (1.08, 2.40) Network 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.80 (0.17, 3.78) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct 0.80 (0.17, 3.78) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) Inj	Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Indirect Indire	Direct		1.61 (1.08, 2.40)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network hijectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Indirect Network Indirect Network Indirect Network Indirect Network	Network		1.31 (0.63, 2.05)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network 1.12 (0.49, 2.53) injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect 1.2 (0.49, 2.53) 1.2 (0.49, 2.53) 1.2 (0.49, 2.53) 1.2 (0.49, 2.53) 1.2 (0.40, 17, 378) 2.19 (0.44, 11.02) 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) 1.01 (0.42, 8.64) 4.65 (2.04, 10.62) Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) 1.12 (0.94, 7.22) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) 0.16 (0.03, 0.60) Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) 0.16 (0.03, 0.60) Network 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) 0.16 (0.03, 0.60) 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) 1.25 (0.45, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0.25, 9.16) 1.25 (0			
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Injectable prostaglandins vs Figometrine Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Legometrine Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Legometrine Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Legometrine Direct Indirect Network Indirect Indire	Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	_	1.12 (0.49, 2.53)
Direct Indirect Indir	Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	1	
Indirect Network Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Misoprostaglandins vs Misoprostol Misoprostaglandins vs Misoprostol Misoprostaglandins vs Ergometrine Misoprostaglandins vs Misoprostol Misoprostaglandins vs	Direct	•	0.80 (0.17, 3.78)
Network 1.00 (0.47, 2.14) Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct 2.31 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 3.82 (1.90, 7.69) Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.61 (0.94, 7.22) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.46) Indirect 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.64 (0.32, 9.16) Indirect 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.31, 2.62) Network 0.68 (0.31, 2.62)	Indirect		2.19 (0.44, 11.02)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network Direct Indirect Network	Network		1.00 (0.47, 2.14)
Direct 2.31 (0.62, 8.64) Indirect 4.65 (2.04, 10.62) A (55 (2.04, 10.62) A (50 (2.6, 7.69) A (2.61 (0.94, 7.22) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Dir	Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		
Indirect 4.65 (2.04, 10.62) Sergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.54 (0.24, 1.26) Network 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.21, 2.21) Network 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	Direct		2.31 (0.62, 8.64)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network 2.90 (1.03, 8.15) Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network 2.61 (0.94, 7.22) Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct 1.25 (0.45, 3.48) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.54 (0.25, 9.16) Indirect 0.50 (0.25, 9.16) Indirect 0.50 (0.25, 9.16) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Indirect 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	indirect Network		4.65 (2.04, 10.62) 3.82 (1.90, 7.69)
Retwork Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Indirect Direct Indirect Indirec	Ergometrine vs Carbetocin		2.00 /1 02
hjectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Indirect Indirect Direct Indirect Indi	Network		2.90 (1.03, 8.15)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol 1/25 (0.45, 3.48) Direct 0.16 (0.03, 0.60) Network 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Direct 0.54 (0.24, 1.26) Indirect 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.68 (0.21, 1.51) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network		2.61 (0.94, 7.22)
Direct 125 (0.45, 3.48) Network 0.16 (0.03, 0.80) Network 0.76 (0.35, 1.64) Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct 0.54 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.54 (0.24, 1.26) Network 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.63 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) Network 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.25, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16) 0.63 (0.25, 09.16) 0.63 (0.22, 09.16	Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		
Interest Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct Indirect Direct	Direct		1.25 (0.45, 3.48)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Nafirect Network	Network		0.16 (0.03, 0.80) 0.76 (0.35, 1.64)
Direct 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.54 (0.24, 1.26) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 0.68 (0.31, 1.51)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol		
Indirect 0.54 (0.24, 1.26) Network 0.68 (0.31, 1.51) Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.54 (0.24, 1.26)	Direct		5.00 (0.25, 99.16)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	Indirect Network		0.54 (0.24, 1.26) 0.68 (0.31, 1.51)
Injectacijionaliti vs Ergometrine 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 2.01) Network 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	televistelle envelopie alle a dia		2.00 (0.01, 1.01)
Indirect 0.63 (0.20, 201) Network 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct	`	5.00 (0.25.99.16)
Network 0.90 (0.31, 2.62)	Indirect	_	0.63 (0.20, 2.01)
	Network		0.90 (0.31, 2.62)
		.1 1 10	

_

Figure 66. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 restricted to oxytocin studies that used an intravenous infusion only of any dose. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 67. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by quality of studies (high quality trials). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 68. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL by quality of studies (high quality trials).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct		0.56 (0.46, 0.69)
Network	•	0.60 (0.46, 0.79)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network	•	0.42 (0.29, 0.61)
Carbetocinius Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	-4	0.75 (0.30, 1.85)
Indirect	•	0.51 (0.34, 0.76)
Network	•	0.54 (0.57, 0.77)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		0.40.40.04.0.000
Network	•	0.48 (0.34, 0.68)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	•	0.72 (0.56, 0.94)
Network	•	0.71 (0.55, 0.91)
Ergemetrine us Blaceba er na traatment		
Network	~	0.15 (0.04, 0.59)
Injectable, prostaglanding vs Placebo or no treatme	nt	
Direct	··· -+	0.55 (0.22, 1.35)
Indirect		0.55 (0.09, 3.55)
Network	-	0.55 (0.21, 1.42)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		0.74/0.55 0.000
Indirect	•	0.74 (0.55, 0.99) 0.55 (0.31, 0.98)
Network	•	0.70 (0.53, 0.92)
Carbetocin vs. Oxytocin		
Direct	1	0.95 (0.79, 1.13)
Indirect Network	1	0.67 (0.34, 1.35)
HELITOIN .]	0.09 (0.07, 1.17)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		0.70 (0.62, 0.07)
Indirect	+	1.19 (0.42, 3.37)
Network	1	0.80 (0.64, 1.00)
Misoprostol vs Oxvtocin		
Direct	t	1.10 (0.88, 1.37)
Indirect Network	F	1.46 (0.98, 2.17)
		1.17 (0.50, 1.40)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct	+	0.25 (0.07 0.88)
Indirect <		→ 1.76 (0.00, .)
Network		0.25 (0.07, 0.96)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Direct	<u>+</u>	0.91 (0.33, 2.48)
Network	+	0.91 (0.34, 2.38)
Direct	+	1.32 (0.51, 3.40)
Indirect	t	1.27 (0.85, 1.90)
Network	ſ	1.27 (0.00, 1.03)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		2.00 (4.07, 2.75)
Indirect	+**	2.00 (1.07, 3.75) 1.01 (0.69, 1.47)
Network	•	1.14 (0.81, 1.62)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxvtocin		
Direct	•	2.48 (1.55, 3.97)
Indirect Network	•	1.49 (1.05, 2.11)
		1.00 (1.20, 2.20)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	_ _	0.36 (0.09, 1.41)
		0.00 (0.03, 1.41)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	↓	1 20 /0 40 2 54
HEITOR		1.30 (0.40, 3.34)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin		0.00 (0.62, 4.20)
NEWOR	I	0.90 (0.03, 1.28)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		0.04 (4.50, 0.50)
Indirect	•	2.31 (1.52, 3.50) 1.12 (0.80, 1.57)
Network	•	1.32 (0.97, 1.80)
Ergometrine vs. Carbetocin		
Network		0.29 (0.07, 1.11)
niectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin		
Network	+	1.02 (0.38, 2.77)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Ovytocin		
Direct	•	1.41 (0.89, 2.25)
Indirect Network	•	1.48 (1.08, 2.02)
HOLIFOIN .	Ī	1.97 (1.11, 1.94)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		0.22 (0.08 4.22)
Network		0.32 (0.08, 1.23)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	Ť	1.14 (0.42, 3.06)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		
Network	-	0.22 (0.06, 0.83)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol		
Network	+	0.77 (0.29, 2.04)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine		
Network	+	3.58 (0.69, 18.49)

Figure 69. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL by quality of studies (high quality trials). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 70. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by quality of studies (high quality trials). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.


Figure 71. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL by quality of studies (high quality trials).

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.70 (0.46, 1.07) 0.50 (0.37, 0.67) 0.56 (0.44, 0.71)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.43 (0.30, 0.62)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.57 (0.42, 0.76)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.55 (0.37, 0.82)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.68 (0.52, 0.89) 0.96 (0.61, 1.50) 0.74 (0.60, 0.93)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.34 (0.01, 11.21) 0.36 (0.04, 2.90)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.77 (0.59, 1.01) 0.87 (0.35, 2.17) 0.78 (0.60, 1.02)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.03 (0.86, 1.23) 0.59 (0.15, 2.29) 1.02 (0.85, 1.22)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.98 (0.71, 1.36) 1.17 (0.38, 3.61) 0.99 (0.72, 1.37)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.35 (1.18, 1.56) 1.18 (0.75, 1.84) 1.34 (1.17, 1.53)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.64 (0.06, 6.57) 0.67 (0.03, 16.36) 0.65 (0.08, 5.25)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.69 (0.11, 4.38) 1.33 (0.97, 1.84) 1.31 (0.95, 1.80)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Network	1.58 (0.62, 4.02) 1.24 (0.78, 1.95) 1.28 (0.85, 1.92)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	2.40 (1.06, 5.44) 1.65 (1.21, 2.26) 1.72 (1.28, 2.21)
Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	0.83 (0.10, 6.85)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	0.98 (0.68, 1.41)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	2.31 (0.62, 8.64) 1.30 (1.04, 1.62) 1.31 (1.05, 1.64)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin	0.64 (0.08, 5.19)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.56 (0.74, 3.30) 1.30 (0.89, 1.89) 1.35 (0.96, 1.89)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	0.65 (0.08, 5.40)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol	0.48 (0.06, 3.92)

Figure 72. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL by quality of studies (high quality trials). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 73. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to studies with funding source at low risk of bias (public or no funding). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 74. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to studies with funding source at low risk of bias (public or no funding).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.59 (0.47, 0.74) 0.70 (0.44, 1.13) 0.63 (0.46, 0.85)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	:	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.37 (0.15, 0.94) 0.37 (0.22, 0.61)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	•	0.60 (0.32, 1.10)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	-	0.52 (0.31, 0.86)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.73 (0.56, 0.96) 0.40 (0.26, 0.63) 0.53 (0.38, 0.73)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 0.98 (0.46, 2.08) 0.54 (0.29, 0.99)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Network	t 📥	7.29 (1.13, 46.90)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.36 (0.14, 0.89) 0.67 (0.37, 1.23) 0.59 (0.35, 1.01)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	0.99 (0.92, 1.06) 0.56 (0.09, 3.62) 0.96 (0.56, 1.64)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	↓ →	0.84 (0.66, 1.07) 2.57 (0.00, 1.26e+28) 0.83 (0.56, 1.23)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-	0.87 (0.68, 1.11) 0.77 (0.42, 1.40) 0.84 (0.65, 1.09)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Diřect – Indirect Network	•	0.25 (0.07, 0.88) 1.11 (0.57, 2.17) 0.86 (0.47, 1.58)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	13.00 (0.77, 219.11) 9.34 (0.06, 1357.99) 11.66 (1.84, 74.04)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	ŧ	1.00 (0.20, 4.89) 1.78 (0.80, 3.97) 1.62 (0.78, 3.34)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	1.40 (0.72, 2.73)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.78 (0.13, 4.53) 1.52 (0.85, 2.72) 1.42 (0.81, 2.48)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	1.45 (0.67, 3.13)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	-	19.72 (2.91, 133.81)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	•	0.87 (0.44, 1.69)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	•	0.88 (0.49, 1.59)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+	0.90 (0.40, 2.02)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network		12.21 (1.78, 83.64)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	•	1.01 (0.63, 1.62)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	+	1.04 (0.50, 2.15)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	-	14.09 (2.13, 93.30)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Diřect Indirect Network	* *	2.08 (0.44, 9.92) 0.36 (0.17, 0.74) 1.02 (0.56, 1.86)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		13.00 (0.77, 219.11) 15.90 (0.11, 2300.48) 13.89 (2.19, 88.08)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	<u>↓</u>	13.00 (0.77, 219.11) 14.82 (0.09, 2359.99) 13.56 (2.08, 88.42)
 ۱ .1	 1 10	

Figure 75. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to studies with funding source at low risk of bias (public or no funding). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 76. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to studies with funding source at low risk of bias (public or no funding). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 77. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to studies with funding source at low risk of bias (public or no funding).

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct • Indirect • Network •	0.59 (0.49, 0.70) 0.52 (0.39, 0.69) 0.57 (0.48, 0.67)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.44 (0.07, 2.77) 0.46 (0.27, 0.76)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.59 (0.46, 0.75)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.54 (0.36, 0.80)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.68 (0.52, 0.89) 0.77 (0.61, 0.96) 0.72 (0.58, 0.91)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.31 (0.06, 1.56) 0.19 (0.05, 0.69)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment	2.15 (0.28, 16.29)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.34 (0.01, 8.21) 0.82 (0.48, 1.42) 0.80 (0.47, 1.37)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.04 (0.87, 1.24) 2.47 (0.10, 63.15) 1.04 (0.86, 1.26)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.95 (0.66, 1.36) 3.13 (0.00, .) 0.95 (0.66, 1.36)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.25 (1.02, 1.54) 1.14 (0.84, 1.56) 1.28 (1.01, 1.60)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Indirect Network	0.30 (0.08, 1.15) 0.34 (0.09, 1.22)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 2.09 (0.01, 336.65) 3.78 (0.50, 28.63)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	3.00 (0.12, 73.17) 1.26 (0.71, 2.23) 1.29 (0.73, 2.27)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	1.18 (0.62, 2.25)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.33 (0.01, 8.04) 1.66 (0.95, 2.91) 1.59 (0.91, 2.76)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	0.42 (0.11, 1.66)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	4.70 (0.58, 37.94)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	0.91 (0.61, 1.37)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	1.23 (0.92, 1.63)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin	0.33 (0.09, 1.19)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	3.64 (0.48, 27.80)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	1.35 (0.88, 2.07)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	0.36 (0.09, 1.35)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	3.99 (0.51, 31.19)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol	0.33 (0.05, 2.11) 0.15 (0.02, 1.05) 0.27 (0.07, 0.95)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.98 (0.01, 157.06) 2.96 (0.39, 22.42)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 82.95 (0.30, 22798.25) 11.16 (1.30, 95.75)

ı.

Figure 78. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to studies with funding source at low risk of bias (public or no funding). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 79. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to studies with an objective method of measuring blood loss. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 80. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to studies with an objective method of measuring blood loss.

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	-	0.62 (0.51, 0.75) 0.58 (0.42, 0.80) 0.60 (0.49, 0.73)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		0.43 (0.31, 0.58)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.44 (0.31, 0.63)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		0.41 (0.31, 0.55)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ -	0.78 (0.63, 0.97) 0.61 (0.45, 0.82) 0.69 (0.56, 0.84)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment	-	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 0.69 (0.48, 0.99) 0.55 (0.39, 0.77)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect		0.55 (0.22, 1.35) 0.64 (0.39, 1.03) 0.62 (0.40, 0.96)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct	•	0.71 (0.57, 0.89) 0.74 (0.48, 1.14)
Network Carbetocin vs Oxytocin	- -	0.72 (0.56, 0.92)
Indirect – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – – –		0.84 (0.06, 1.07) 0.40 (0.19, 0.88) 0.75 (0.56, 0.99)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	- -	0.68 (0.55, 0.84) 0.88 (0.39, 1.94) 0.69 (0.56, 0.85)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	*	1.14 (1.00, 1.31) 1.22 (0.89, 1.66) 1.16 (1.01, 1.32)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.21 (0.60, 2.44) 0.77 (0.52, 1.14) 0.93 (0.68, 1.26)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Natwork	* <u></u>	0.84 (0.26, 2.71) 1.09 (0.66, 1.77) 1.04 (0.69, 1.58)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		0.56 (0.19, 1.62) 1.12 (0.76, 1.64)
Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		1.04 (0.72, 1.50)
Indirect – Network	*	0.83 (0.57, 1.21) 0.96 (0.70, 1.32)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	2.33 (1.67, 3.26) 1.34 (0.96, 1.86) 1.61 (1.23, 2.10)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	1.29 (0.88, 1.89)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.09 (0.66, 1.81) 1.73 (0.99, 3.03) 1.45 (0.93, 2.25)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	_ + _	0.93 (0.65, 1.31)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	 	2.31 (1.52, 3.50) 1.39 (1.00, 1.94) 1.55 (1.14, 2.10)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+-	1.24 (0.82, 1.89)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	_ •-	1.40 (0.84, 2.32)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.93 (0.99, 3.78) 1.62 (1.24, 2.11) 1.67 (1.32, 2.12)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	-	1.34 (0.93, 1.94)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		1.51 (0.95, 2.39)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	 	1.06 (0.74, 1.52) 0.58 (0.37, 0.91) 0.80 (0.59, 1.09)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		2.89 (0.46, 18.39) 0.67 (0.41, 1.09) 0.90 (0.59, 1.37)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		1.42 (0.64, 3.17) 0.87 (0.47, 1.63) 1.12 (0.71, 1.77)
.1	1 10	

Figure 81. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to studies with an objective method of measuring blood loss. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 82. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to studies with an objective method of measuring blood loss. The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 83. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to studies with an objective method of measuring blood loss.

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.59 (0.49, 0.71) 0.57 (0.41, 0.80) 0.58 (0.48, 0.71)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.48 (0.32, 0.72)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.52 (0.36, 0.76)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.50 (0.36, 0.71)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Network	0.73 (0.56, 0.95) 0.64 (0.44, 0.92) 0.70 (0.57, 0.86)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.81 (0.33, 2.04) 0.57 (0.25, 1.31)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.39 (0.14, 1.12) 0.38 (0.14, 1.02)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.56 (0.36, 0.88) 1.50 (0.86, 2.64) 0.82 (0.56, 1.20)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.97 (0.72, 1.31) 0.23 (0.09, 0.62) 0.89 (0.62, 1.29)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.84 (0.63, 1.13) 1.19 (0.46, 3.04) 0.86 (0.64, 1.16)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.17 (0.98, 1.38) 1.33 (0.94, 1.89) 1.20 (0.99, 1.46)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Diřect Indirect Network	1.52 (0.47, 4.92) 0.55 (0.16, 1.90) 0.97 (0.42, 2.23)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.43 (0.20, 10.31) 0.42 (0.13, 1.32) 0.66 (0.25, 1.73)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.27 (0.10, 0.76) 1.50 (0.95, 2.36) 1.09 (0.67, 1.77)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 0.93 (0.52, 1.67) 1.05 (0.66, 1.67)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	2.27 (1.28, 4.04) 1.13 (0.67, 1.92) 1.47 (0.98, 2.18)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	1.19 (0.48, 2.93)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.36 (0.11, 1.23) 2.57 (0.58, 11.51) 0.80 (0.31, 2.09)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	0.96 (0.61, 1.53)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	2.31 (0.62, 8.64) 1.31 (0.95, 1.80) 1.34 (0.96, 1.87)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin	1.09 (0.45, 2.65)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin	0.74 (0.26, 2.05)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.85 (1.03, 3.33) 1.24 (0.81, 1.88) 1.39 (0.99, 1.96)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	1.13 (0.47, 2.73)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	0.76 (0.28, 2.09)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	1.73 (0.38, 7.85) 0.27 (0.07, 1.09) 0.81 (0.35, 1.87)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine	→ 5.00 (0.25, 99, 16) 0.33 (0.08, 1.33) 0.68 (0.20, 2.31)
.1 1 10	

Figure 84. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to studies with an objective method of measuring blood loss. Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 85. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to large studies (> 400 participants). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 86. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 500 mL restricted to large studies (> 400 participants).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Difect Indirect Network	:	0.59 (0.48, 0.71) 0.57 (0.40, 0.80) 0.57 (0.45, 0.72)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Difect Indirect Network	•	0.37 (0.30, 0.46) 0.40 (0.28, 0.56) 0.39 (0.29, 0.51)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	•	0.56 (0.28, 1.12)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	•	0.40 (0.27, 0.59)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.79 (0.63, 0.99) 0.50 (0.36, 0.68) 0.61 (0.48, 0.78)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Difect Indirect Network	•	0.24 (0.14, 0.42) 1.09 (0.68, 1.74) 0.74 (0.48, 1.14)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatmer Network	nt 📕	0.56 (0.25, 1.28)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Difect Indirect Network		0.71 (0.54, 0.94) 0.66 (0.45, 0.96) 0.68 (0.54, 0.86)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct		0.99 (0.92, 1.06)
Indirect Network	+	3.08 (0.00,) 0.99 (0.52, 1.88)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs. Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	0.71 (0.54, 0.92) 0.77 (0.31, 1.94) 0.70 (0.51, 0.97)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.07 (0.87, 1.32) 1.86 (0.74, 1.53) 1.07 (0.91, 1.27)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Difect Indirect Network	*	1.44 (0.87, 2.36) 1.22 (0.72, 2.08) 1.30 (0.86, 1.96)
lnjectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network	+	0.99 (0.44, 2.22)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	1.45 (0.73, 2.87)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-	1.39 (0.65, 2.99) 0.89 (0.56, 1.41) 1.03 (0.71, 1.50)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	1.75 (1.25, 2.45) 1.43 (1.02, 1.99) 1.58 (1.24, 2.01)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	*	1.90 (1.21, 3.00)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	*	1.45 (0.94, 2.24) 6.41 (0.00, .) 1.45 (0.67, 3.14)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	4	0.71 (0.35, 1.46)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.09 (0.56, 2.12)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.31 (0.61, 2.83)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.00 (0.36, 2.81)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + •	1.93 (0.99, 3.76) 1.37 (0.90, 2.07) 1.53 (1.08, 2.16)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	+	1.85 (1.10, 3.09)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	•	1.41 (0.60, 3.32)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Difect Indirect Network	+	1.78 (0.70, 4.55) 0.71 (0.39, 1.31) 1.21 (0.80, 1.82)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Network	+	0.92 (0.41, 2.07)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Network	+	0.76 (0.31, 1.87)
	- + -	

Figure 87. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL restricted to large studies (> 400 participants). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 88. Network diagram for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to large studies (> 400 participants). The nodes represent an intervention and their size is proportional to the number of trials comparing this intervention to any other in the network. The lines connecting each pair of interventions represent a direct comparison and are drawn proportional to the number of trials making each direct comparison.



Figure 89. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analysis for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL restricted to large studies (> 400 participants).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.61 (0.51, 0.72) 0.53 (0.41, 0.68) 0.58 (0.50, 0.67)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatmen Direct Indirect Network	it	0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.45 (0.35, 0.59) 0.45 (0.36, 0.58)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.61 (0.48, 0.77)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	•	0.49 (0.33, 0.73)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.74 (0.56, 0.98) 0.76 (0.62, 0.95) 0.75 (0.64, 0.88)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.84 (0.33, 2.17) 0.57 (0.24, 1.35)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatm Network	nent _	0.80 (0.23, 2.78)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.73 (0.57, 0.93) 0.95 (0.64, 1.41) 0.78 (0.64, 0.97)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect <		→ 1.05 (0.87, 1.26) 3.53 (0.00, .) 1.05 (0.87, 1.26)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.82 (0.49, 1.36) 1.25 (0.53, 2.94) 0.85 (0.59, 1.23)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.33 (1.16, 1.51) 1.20 (0.91, 1.56) 1.30 (1.16, 1.46)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	1.37 (0.39, 4.83) 0.69 (0.21, 2.24) 0.99 (0.42, 2.32)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network	+	1.39 (0.40, 4.77)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	•	1.34 (1.01, 1.77)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	ţ	1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 0.98 (0.58, 1.66) 1.09 (0.72, 1.65)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct		1 61 (1 04 2 49)
Indirect Network	:	1.70 (1.31, 2.21) 1.66 (1.32, 2.08)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	1.26 (0.52, 3.02)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytoc Direct Indirect Network	sin 🔶	→ 1.77 (0.52, 5.97) 4.47 (0.00, .) 1.77 (0.52, 5.97)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	+	0.81 (0.54, 1.23)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	•	1.24 (0.99, 1.55)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	+	0.94 (0.39, 2.26)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.32 (0.38, 4.61)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	*	1.85 (1.03, 3.33) 1.40 (0.88, 2.23) 1.52 (1.04, 2.23)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	+	1.16 (0.46, 2.93)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytoc Network	in 🔶	1.63 (0.45, 5.89)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	-+- -+	1.37 (0.28, 6.61) 0.21 (0.04, 1.05) 0.76 (0.32, 1.78)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Network	+	1.07 (0.31, 3.68)
Įnjectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine	_ _	1 41 (0 31 6 30)

Figure 90. Cumulative rankograms comparing each of the uterotonic drugs for prevention of PPH \geq 1000 mL restricted to large studies (> 400 participants). Ranking indicates the cumulative probability of being the best drug, the second best, the third best, etc. The x axis shows the relative ranking and the y-axis the cumulative probability of each ranking. We estimate the SUrface underneath this Cumulative RAnking line (SUCRA); the larger the SUCRA the higher its rank among all available drug options.



Figure 91. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for prevention of PPH \geq 500 mL (all comparisons).

	•	
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	‡	0.61 (0.52, 0.7 0.57 (0.43, 0.7 0.58 (0.49, 0.7
Francisking October 10		
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct	→	0.37 (0.30, 0.4
Indirect	→	0.42 (0.33, 0.5
Network	+	0.41 (0.33, 0.5
Carbelocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	+	0.75 (0.30, 1.8
Indirect	- +	0.40 (0.29, 0.5
Network	→	0.42 (0.31, 0.5
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network	+	0.41 (0.31, 0.5
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct	-	0.75 (0.59, 0.9
Indirect	+	0.57 (0.45, 0.7
Network	+	0.63 (0.52, 0.7
Direct	_ -	0.24 (0.14.0.4
Indirect	· -+-	0.73 (0.55, 0.9
Network		0.63 (0.48, 0.8
Injectable prostanlandins vs Placebo or no freatment		
Direct		0.55 (0.22, 1.3
Indirect		0.62 (0.41, 0.9
Network .	- - -	0.61 (0.42, 0.9
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxvtocin		
Direct	≁	0.72 (0.57, 0.9
Indirect	<u>*</u>	0.69 (0.54, 0.9
network	~	0.70 (0.59, 0.8
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct		0.75 (0.58, 0.9
Indirect	- • - †	0.59 (0.31, 1.1
mutwork.		0.72 (0.56, 0.9
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	*	0.71 (0.59, 0.8
Indirect		0.79 (0.35, 1.7
PROVING R	~	0.70 (0.58, 0.8
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin		
Direct	t	1.08 (0.94, 1.2
Indirect Network	T	1.07 (0.83, 1.3
	Г	1.00 (0.30, 1.2
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin	Ι.	
Direct		1.31 (0.86, 1.9
Network	T	0.96 (0.70, 1.3
	Ĩ	1.00 (0.00), 1.0
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Direct		0.84 (0.26, 2.7
Network		1.05 (0.72, 1.6
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct	<u> </u>	0.96 (0.44, 2.0
Network		1.03 (0.77, 1.3
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct	—	1.39 (0.65, 2.9
Network	+	1.00 (0.78, 1.3
Direct	→	1.75 (1.35, 2.2
Indirect	-	1.40 (1.10, 1.7
Network	+	1.55 (1.29, 1.8
Direct	_ _	0.17 (0.01.4.0
Indirect	· +	1.58 (1.19, 2.1
Network		1.55 (1.17, 2.0
Injectable prostanjandine ve Erropectrine - Onder-		
Direct	 •-	1.29 (0.92, 1.7
Indirect	_●	1.77 (1.07, 2.9
Network	⊢	1.50 (1.05, 2.1
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin		
Network	+	0.97 (0.71. 1.3
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		
Indirect		2.31 (1.52, 3.5
Network	—	1.50 (1.04, 1.8
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin		
Network	 −●−	1.50 (1.06, 2.1
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin		
Network	⊢ •−	1.45 (0.94, 2.2
Missennatal un Missennatal / O- +		
Direct	⊢ ⊷	1.93 (0.99 3 7
Indirect	→	1.47 (1.16, 1.8
Network	≁	1.54 (1.23, 1.9
Errometrine ve Misoprostol- Ovadosia		
Network	 _ ⊷ _	1.55 (1.13, 2.1
		1.00 (1.10, 2.1
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	H •-	1.49 (0.99, 2.2
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		1.18 (0.79, 1.7
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct		
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect	-	0.73 (0.49, 1.0
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	-+- -+	0.73 (0.49, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol	-	0.73 (0.49, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct		0.73 (0.49, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2 1.60 (0.57, 4.5
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direkt Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direkt Indirect		0.73 (0.49, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2 1.60 (0.57, 4.5 0.81 (0.54, 1.2
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network ingricable prostaglandms vs Misoprostol Direct Direct Network		0.73 (0.49, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2 1.60 (0.57, 4.5 0.81 (0.54, 1.2 0.97 (0.68, 1.3
Engometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine		0.73 (0.49, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2 1.60 (0.57, 4.5 0.81 (0.54, 1.2 0.97 (0.68, 1.3
Engometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Direct Indirect Network Network		0.73 (0.40, 1.0 1.00 (0.79, 1.2 1.60 (0.57, 4.5 0.81 (0.54, 1.2 0.97 (0.68, 1.3
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network Direct Direct Direct Network Network Network Seguinations vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		0.73 (0.49, 10 1.00 (0.79, 12 1.60 (0.57, 4.5 0.81 (0.54, 12 0.97 (0.68, 13 1.42 (0.64, 3.1 0.77 (0.47, 12 0.77 (0.47, 12

Figure 92. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for prevention of PPH \ge 1000 mL (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.61 (0.52, 0.73) 0.56 (0.42, 0.75) 0.59 (0.50, 0.70)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.44 (0.18, 1.05) 0.50 (0.38, 0.66) 0.49 (0.38, 0.63)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	- -	0.52 (0.37, 0.73)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.52 (0.39, 0.69)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++++	0.73 (0.56, 0.95) 0.68 (0.51, 0.90) 0.71 (0.59, 0.85)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.09 (0.01, 0.72) 0.70 (0.34, 1.43) 0.56 (0.28, 1.10)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.36 (0.04, 3.24) 0.54 (0.24, 1.22) 0.52 (0.24, 1.13)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct	+	0.73 (0.57, 0.93)
Indirect Network	- + - -+	1.07 (0.75, 1.54) 0.83 (0.66, 1.03)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.73 (0.45, 1.19) 0.30 (0.13, 0.72) 0.87 (0.62, 1.21)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.87 (0.69, 1.09) 1.17 (0.47, 2.86) 0.88 (0.70, 1.11)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	1.26 (1.11, 1.43) 1.23 (0.92, 1.64) 1.19 (1.01, 1.42)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.30 (0.52, 3.27) 0.61 (0.22, 1.67) 0.94 (0.48, 1.84)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.43 (0.20, 10.31) 0.74 (0.31, 1.72) 0.88 (0.41, 1.89)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		0.34(0.13, 0.86)
Indirect Network	+	1.23 (0.91, 1.66) 1.05 (0.73, 1.51)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	1.41 (0.68, 2.94) 1.02 (0.72, 1.44) 1.06 (0.78, 1.45)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-+- -+ -+	1.61 (1.08, 2.40) 1.38 (1.01, 1.88) 1.45 (1.14, 1.84)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	_	1.14 (0.57, 2.29)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.80 (0.17, 3.78) 2.36 (0.55, 10.17) 1.07 (0.50, 2.25)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	\downarrow	1.01 (0.68, 1.50)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect		2.31 (0.62, 8.64) 1.35 (1.00, 1.81)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin		1.08 (0.52, 2.25)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network		1.01 (0.45, 2.31)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		1.85 (1.03, 3.33) 1.26 (0.92, 1.73) 1.36 (1.03, 4.70)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		1.07 (0.53, 0.47)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		1.00 (0.45, 2.22)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect		1.25 (0.45, 3.48) 0.31 (0.09, 1.11) 0.79 (0.40, 1.54)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect		 → 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.57 (0.25, 1.29)
Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect		 0.74 (0.34, 1.60) → 5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 0.66 (0.23, 1.92)
Network		0.94 (0.35, 2.52)
	.1 1 10	

Figure 93. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for prevention of maternal death (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_ - _	1.60 (0.11, 23.86)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	- -	3.20 (0.13, 77.79)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		1.00 (0.10, 9.59) → 0.79 (0.00, ∞) 1.00 (0.10, 9.59)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		2.00 (0.37, 10.92) → 0.34 (0.00, ∞) 2.00 (0.37, 10.92)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.62 (0.14, 2.74) 1.00 (0.00, ∞) 0.62 (0.14, 2.74)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	-•	0.31 (0.03, 2.97)
	.1 1 10	

Figure 94. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for prevention of severe maternal morbidity: Intensive care admissions (all comparisons).

Comparison	RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.86 (0.11, 6.99)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	2.58 (0.06, 117.87)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	1.00 (0.11, 8.74)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.43 (0.02, 10.33)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	1.00 (0.14, 7.05) → 1.10 (0.00, ∞) 1.00 (0.14, 7.05)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.33 (0.01, 14.10)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	2.99 (0.12, 73.32) → 1.01 (0.00, ∞) 2.99 (0.12, 73.32)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.16 (0.67, 2.02) → 1.56 (0.00, ∞) 1.16 (0.67, 2.02)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	0.50 (0.05, 5.47) 1.20 (0.00, ∞) 0.50 (0.05, 5.47)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	1.16 (0.55, 2.43) → 1.05 (0.00, ∞) 1.16 (0.55, 2.43)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Network	0.39 (0.01, 10.27)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	0.39 (0.02, 9.98)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	0.17 (0.00, 9.04)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	0.39 (0.01, 10.30)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	0.13 (0.00, 12.59)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Network	0.43 (0.04, 5.00)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	0.99 (0.39, 2.51)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	0.33 (0.01, 9.25)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	2.33 (0.19, 28.64)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	0.78 (0.01, 45.20)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	0.33 (0.01, 8.16) → 0.76 (0.00, ∞) 0.33 (0.01, 8.16)
I I I .1 1 10	

Figure 95. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for additional uterotonics (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.43 (0.32, 0.58) 0.43 (0.29, 0.63) 0.42 (0.32, 0.56)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.19 (0.15, 0.24) 0.32 (0.22, 0.47) 0.28 (0.20, 0.39)
Carbetocin va Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Hotivock Hotivock		0.19 (0.12, 0.32) 0.19 (0.13, 0.29) 0.19 (0.13, 0.27)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.24 (0.16, 0.35)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect		0.67 (0.52, 0.87) 0.36 (0.25, 0.53)
Network Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		0.44 (0.33, 0.59)
Direct Indirect Vetwork		0.18 (0.09, 0.37) 0.47 (0.30, 0.74) 0.41 (0.27, 0.61)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network Network		0.66 (0.21, 2.09) 0.19 (0.10, 0.37) 0.23 (0.13, 0.43)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect	-	0.79 (0.59, 1.07) 0.57 (0.40, 0.81) 0.65 (0.50, 0.85)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.48 (0.34, 0.68) 0.35 (0.22, 0.67) 0.45 (0.34, 0.69)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct		0.54 (0.44, 0.67)
Indirect •	<u> </u>	0.68 (0.31, 1.51) 0.56 (0.42, 0.73)
Misopostol va Oxytocin	+ + +	1.01 (0.85, 1.20) 1.18 (0.81, 1.73) 1.04 (0.88, 1.24)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.46 (0.61, 3.48) 0.83 (0.55, 1.26) 0.97 (0.69, 1.36)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Vetwork		0.29 (0.09, 0.94) 0.78 (0.38, 1.59) 0.55 (0.31, 0.96)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	-	0.54 (0.30, 1.00) 0.76 (0.51, 1.14) 0.68 (0.49, 0.94)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		1.48 (0.82, 2.69) 0.77 (0.52, 1.15) 0.85 (0.59, 1.22)
Misopostol vs Engemetrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	- -	1.87 (1.49, 2.36) 1.35 (0.95, 1.93)
retwork Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Natuurir		1.60 (1.21, 2.09)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	•	1.07 (0.16, 7.36)
Indirect Network	—	0.83 (0.44, 1.54) 0.84 (0.46, 1.53)
Misopostol Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	•	1.19 (0.74, 1.93) 1.26 (0.85, 1.86) 1.25 (0.86, 1.80)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	=	3.96 (1.55, 10.07) 2.27 (1.66, 3.10) 2.34 (1.72, 3.18)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	- _	2.17 (1.42, 3.32)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	•	1.23 (0.67, 2.29)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	ŧ	1.89 (1.26, 2.83) 1.88 (1.33, 2.66) 1.87 (1.38, 2.55)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_ 	1.74 (1.14, 2.67)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		0.99 (0.53, 1.84)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	↓ ₩	1.04 (0.68, 1.60) 0.68 (0.38, 1.24) 0.93 (0.67, 1.28)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect		1.02 (0.28, 3.69)
Network		0.53 (0.30, 0.93)
Direct Indirect Network		0.78 (0.40, 1.51) 0.37 (0.16, 0.83) 0.57 (0.31, 1.03)
!		

Figure 96. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for blood transfusion (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	•	0.75 (0.51, 1.12) 0.42 (0.23, 0.75) 0.60 (0.41, 0.87)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		0.34 (0.18, 0.66) 0.58 (0.35, 0.98) 0.46 (0.31, 0.69)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_	0.48 (0.26, 0.89)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		0.30 (0.19, 0.50)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	-	0.46 (0.15, 1.47) 0.53 (0.34, 0.84) 0.52 (0.35, 0.80)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+	0.34 (0.04, 3.28) 0.72 (0.31, 1.67) 0.66 (0.30, 1.45)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.39 (0.14, 1.08)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	0.88 (0.53, 1.44) 0.64 (0.41, 1.00) 0.77 (0.58, 1.03)
Carbetocin vs Oxylocin Direct Indirect Hetwork	+	0.68 (0.38, 1.22) 0.62 (0.21, 1.85) 0.81 (0.49, 1.32)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Hetwork	<u>.</u>	0.50 (0.37, 0.67) 0.77 (0.27, 2.26) 0.51 (0.37, 0.70)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct	•	0.81 (0.65, 1.00)
Indirect Network	•	1.02 (0.59, 1.77) 0.88 (0.68, 1.13)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	↓	1.44 (0.20, 10.23) 1.01 (0.38, 2.68) 1.11 (0.54, 2.28)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	1.01 (0.04, 23.65) 0.49 (0.16, 1.52) 0.66 (0.25, 1.72)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	<u>↓</u>	1.42 (0.42, 4.82) 0.97 (0.52, 1.81) 1.04 (0.60, 1.80)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	•	0.89 (0.36, 2.19) 0.61 (0.38, 0.97) 0.66 (0.43, 1.00)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	<u> </u> <u>↓</u>	1.41 (0.91, 2.21) 0.90 (0.57, 1.42) 1.13 (0.82, 1.56)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		1.43 (0.67, 3.05)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	0.65 (0.17, 2.53) 1.04 (0.29, 3.78) 0.85 (0.32, 2.22)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network		4.00 (0.45, 35.46) 0.56 (0.32, 0.97) 0.63 (0.36, 1.11)
Misoprositol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Perhavick	↓ •	2.97 (0.12, 71.85) 1.06 (0.61, 1.86) 1.08 (0.62, 1.90)
Ergometrine vs Carbelocin Network	_	1.37 (0.57, 3.29)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	•	0.81 (0.28, 2.39)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		2.97 (1.40, 6.30) 1.44 (0.93, 2.23) 1.72 (1.16, 2.56)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		2.18 (0.99, 4.78)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	- -	1.29 (0.47, 3.55)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	•	1.71 (0.65, 4.50) 0.78 (0.24, 2.54) 1.27 (0.62, 2.60)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Avenue	<u>↓</u>	0.88 (0.14, 5.39) 0.61 (0.19, 2.01) 0.75 (0.29, 1.97)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	+	1.01 (0.04, 23.58) 0.35 (0.08, 1.44) 0.59 (0.20, 1.79)
4	1 10	

Figure 97. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for mean blood loss (ml) (all comparisons).

Comparison		Mean Differences (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	*	-118.52 (-141.40, -95.64) -27.19 (-79.51, 25.14) -56.98 (-98.15, -15.82)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		-35.02 (-101.63, 31.59) -93.76 (-147.66, -39.86) -82.24 (-130.59, -33.89)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	• =	-274.00 (-591.60, 43.60) -135.26 (-190.82, -79.71) -138.37 (-193.24, -83.50)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	—	-145.29 (-201.55, -89.03)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	_	-42.07 (-52.47, -31.68) -88.91 (-148.00, -29.81) -66.33 (-106.96, -25.69)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		-50 64 (-119.92, 18.65) -52.53 (-105.09, 0.02) -52 16 (-99 32 - 4 99)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Direct		-95.17 (-296.09, 105.75)
Indirect Network		-91.44 (-155.66, -27.22) -87.43 (-144.93, -29.93)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+	-10.31 (-40.32, 19.70) -34.53 (-79.23, 10.17) -25.26 (-59.15, 8.64)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		-92.73 (-154.97, -30.49) -68.57 (-147.48, 10.33) -81.39 (-119.91, -42.87)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	<u>+</u>	-87 26 (-157.83, -16.69) -65 33 (-288.87, 158 20) -88 31 (-127.08, -49.54)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	4	-8.90 (-23.45, 5.65) -6.35 (-52.97, 40.26) -9.34 (-31.08, 12.39)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	ŧ	8.09 (-17.83, 34.00) 3.07 (-39.95, 46.09) 4.82 (-28.00, 37.64)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		-15.83 (-152.28, 120.62) -35.05 (-91.18, 21.09) -30.45 (-77.41, 16.51)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	* *	-44.08 (-82.41, -5.75) -63.69 (-121.44, -5.95) -56.13 (-100.58, -11.69)
Misoprostal+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	*	-16.00 (-40.24, 8.24) -68.72 (-122.49, -14.94) -63.05 (-113.73, -12.38)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	22.86 (4.50, 41.22) 4.78 (-40.68, 50.24) 15.54 (-19.44, 51.27)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	•	20.10 (5.76, 34.44) 30.37 (-14.18, 76.12) 30.08 (-14.05, 73.22)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect		-26.18 (-104.63, 52.27) 0.84 (-56.98, 58.67)
Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin	Ţ	-5.19 (-59.05, 48.67)
Network Misoprostol vs Carbetocin		-6.92 (-61.36, 47.51)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin		12.05 (29.01, 115.02) 86.04 (26.69, 405.75)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin		50.21 (36.86, 133.73)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	• •	48.00 (24.68, 71.32) 81.69 (36.65, 127.72) 78 07 (24.09, 120.05)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		10.31 (04.39, 122.39) 93 13 (42 62 143 65)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	_	57.86 (-2.79, 118.52)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		11.66 (-9.85, 33.17) 16.36 (-33.99, 66.71) 14 17 (-17.49, 45.83)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		52.99 (-39.74, 145.71) -44.82 (-98.76, 9.12) -21.10 (-50.09.05.92)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		-21.10(-60.05, 20.02) -16.08(-57.17, 25.00) -79.13(-156.52, -1.74) -35.27(-80.16, 9.62)
592	0	 592

Figure 98. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for change in haemoglobin measurements before and after birth (g/L) (all comparisons).

Comparison	Mean Differences (95% CI)
Oxylocin vs Placebo or no treatment	-2.68 (-4.47, -0.89) -1.68 (-3.99, 0.62) -2.14 (-3.87, -0.41)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	-3.57 (-6.50, -0.63) -3.09 (-5.34, -0.84) -3.21 (-5.13, -1.29)
Carbelocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Hetwork	-3.40 (-7.23, 0.43) -4.47 (-6.71, -2.23) -4.33 (-6.42, -2.23)
Misoprostol+Oxylocin vs Placebo or no treatment	-4.67 (-6.77, -2.57)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct	-2.53 (-3.53, -1.52)
Indirect • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	-2.53 (-4.94, -0.11) -2.22 (-3.94, -0.50)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	-0.50 (-0.58, -0.42) -1.34 (-3.83, 1.15) -1.17 (-3.37, 1.04)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment	0.90 (0.56, 1.24)
Indirect	-3.10 (-7.00, 0.80) -1.54 (-4.59, 1.52)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-2.23 (-5.24, 0.77) -0.39 (-2.07, 1.29) -1.07 (-2.38, 0.25)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct	-1.66 (-3.81, 0.50)
Indirect Network	-3.27 (-5.69, -0.84) -2.18 (-3.57, -0.79)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	-2.59 (-3.70, -1.48) -2.18 (-5.85, 1.50) -2.53 (-3.80, -1.26)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect	-0.14 (-0.74, 0.47) 0.03 (-2.08, 2.14) -0.08 (-0.97, 0.82)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect	0.42 (-0.30, 1.13) 1.20 (-0.78, 3.17) 0.98 (-0.74, 2.69)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network	0.60 (-2.23, 3.44)
Carbelocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Hetwork	-2.57 (-4.32, -0.82) 0.09 (-2.04, 2.23) -1.12 (-2.70, 0.46)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Hetwork	-0.50 (-1.72, 0.72) -1.73 (-3.70, 0.24) -1.46 (-3.19, 0.27)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct indirect	- 1.09 (-0.49, 2.67) 0.84 (-1.15, 2.82)
Network Ergometrine vS Ergometrine +Oxytocin	0.99 (-0.36, 2.33)
Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	2.04 (0.03, 4.05)
Network Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin	1.67 (-1.34, 4.67)
Direct Indirect Network	-1.70 (-3.72, 0.32) -0.16 (-2.09, 1.76) -0.34 (-2.14, 1.46)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	2.10 (0.53, 3.68)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	3.16(1.01, 5.31)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	2.79 (-0.32, 5.90)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect	0.27 (-0.42, 0.96) 3.23 (1.54, 4.92)
Ergometrie vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	2.40 (0.97, 3.93)
Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	3.50 (1.41, 5.59)
Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol	• 3.13 (0.06, 6.20)
Direct Indirect Network	0.91 (-0.43, 2.26) 1.65 (-1.87, 5.17) - 1.05 (-0.51, 2.62)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	2.28 (-1.35, 5.90) -1.88 (-6.26, 2.49) 0.68 (-2.05, 3.42)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	-1.28 (-6.58, 4.01) 1.23 (-3.43, 5.88) -0.37 (-3.16, 2.41)
-7.23 0	7.23

Figure 99. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for breastfeeding at discharge (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Direct	+	1.00 (0.95, 1.05)
Indirect	+	1.04 (0.99, 1.09)
Network	•	1.02 (0.98, 1.06)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no trea	atment	
Direct	+	1.03 (0.99, 1.07)
Indirect	+	0.98 (0.93, 1.04)
Network	•	1.01 (0.97, 1.05)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network	1	0.96 (0.87, 1.06)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	+	0.99 (0.96, 1.01)
ndirect	+	1.03 (0.97, 1.10)
Network	•	0.99 (0.96, 1.03)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	+	0.94 (0.86, 1.03)
Indirect		→ 0.95 (0.00, ∞)
Network	•	0.94 (0.86, 1.03)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Network	4	0.95 (0.86, 1.04)

Figure 100. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for nausea (all comparisons).

	RR (95% CI)
	0.82 (0.47, 1.42) 0.98 (0.53, 1.83) 0.88 (0.53, 1.48)
+	1.95 (1.38, 2.76) 1.72 (0.89, 3.33) 1.78 (1.03, 3.08)
	0.88 (0.48, 1.61)
 •-	1.65 (0.81, 3.36)
	1.18 (0.78, 1.78) 1.30 (0.63, 2.67) 1.24 (0.75, 2.06)
	→ 42.10 (2.55, 694.80) 1.87 (1.03, 3.40) 2.11 (4.18, 3.80)
	0.25 (0.02, 8.45)
	2.23 (0.97, 5.09) 1.98 (0.89, 4.43)
+ + +	1.72 (0.84, 3.53) 2.35 (1.49, 3.69) 2.03 (1.47, 2.80)
-	1.11 (0.78, 1.56) 0.79 (0.43, 1.46) 1.00 (0.71, 1.41)
	0.01 (1.10, 1.41)
	1.03 (0.36, 2.97) 1.88 (1.14, 3.09)
+ -+ +	1.22 (0.93, 1.60) 2.13 (1.34, 3.38) 1.41 (1.10, 1.81)
	4.56 (1.13, 18.44) 2.00 (1.28, 3.10) 2.40 (1.65, 3.49)
	1.17 (0.40, 3.41) 2.99 (1.36, 6.57)
	2.25 (1.16, 4.39)
	0.29 (0.19, 0.45) 0.67 (0.40, 1.12) 0.49 (0.33, 0.74)
4	0.93 (0.52, 1.65)
*	0.71 (0.61, 0.84) 0.69 (0.45, 1.07) 0.70 (0.49, 0.99)
_	1.18 (0.75, 1.87)
_ _	5.06 (1.12, 22.86) 0.84 (0.39, 1.81)
+	1.11 (0.55, 2.25)
	1.21 (0.62, 2.39) 2.15 (1.12, 4.14) 1.87 (1.06, 3.30)
	0.99 (0.47, 2.08) 1.48 (0.96, 2.27)
–	1.41 (0.94, 2.11)
-	2.40 (1.47, 3.92)
	2.25 (1.08, 4.71) 1.83 (0.73, 4.57)
	0.63 (0.35, 1.15) 0.75 (0.44, 1.30)
+-	1.28 (0.69, 2.36)
- +	1.20 (0.53, 2.74)
+ + +	1.53 (1.15, 2.04) 3.10 (1.55, 6.20) 1.70 (1.22, 2.36)
	0.23 (0.06, 0.92) 2.60 (1.30, 5.22) 1.60 (0.82, 3.09)
Ļ	1 70 (0 98 2 94)
	0.42 (0.16, 1.14) 0.94 (0.48, 1.82)

Figure 101. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for vomiting (all comparisons).

Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct	_ .	1.40 (0.44, 4.41)
Indirect Network	±	0.93 (0.53, 1.64) 0.98 (0.58, 1.66)
Direct	+	2.15 (1.46, 3.18)
Indirect Network		3.66 (1.80, 7.44) 2.88 (1.73, 4.78)
Carbelocin vs Placebo or no freatment		
Network	-	0.91 (0.49, 1.68)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
Network		2.07 (1.08, 3.97)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment	-	1 41 (0.02 2 16)
Indirect	- - -	1.48 (0.73, 3.03)
Network		1.61 (0.98, 2.62)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		05 57 (4 50 400 7
Indirect	-	2.10 (1.15, 3.81)
Network		2.31 (1.28, 4.18)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Network		3.69 (1.65, 8.26)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	+	3.05 (1.76, 5.29)
Network	+	2.93 (2.08, 4.13)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	#	0.90 (0.53, 1.50) 1.00 (0.51, 1.95)
Network	+	0.93 (0.64, 1.35)
Misoprostoi+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
Direct	_	2.24 (1.52, 3.31) 1.48 (0.52, 4.27)
Network	-	2.11 (1.39, 3.18)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin		
Direct	↓	1.51 (1.19, 1.91) 2.73 (1.66, 4.50)
Network	+	1.63 (1.25, 2.14)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin		
Direct	— •	3.83 (1.10, 13.28) 1.83 (1.18, 2.84)
Network	-	2.36 (1.56, 3.55)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		
Direct	++++	2.48 (0.57, 10.73) 4.07 (1.93, 8.60)
Network		3.76 (1.90, 7.42)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	10 - 10 - 10	
Direct		0.27 (0.16, 0.46) 0.34 (0.20, 0.61)
Network	-	0.32 (0.20, 0.49)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct	-+-	1.04 (0.23, 4.77) 0.68 (0.39, 1.20)
Network	-+	0.72 (0.43, 1.20)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
Direct	–	0.72 (0.50, 1.04) 0.50 (0.32, 0.78)
Network	+	0.56 (0.39, 0.79)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		Section of Article
Network	-	0.80 (0.50, 1.29)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct		0.92 (0.40. 2.13)
Indirect	- <u>+</u> •	1.49 (0.64, 3.46)
Network	_	1.28 (0.64, 2.57)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Direct	_ _	1 33/0 58 3 00
Indirect		2.55 (1.43, 4.57)
Network		2.27 (1.34, 3.85)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct		1 /8 /0 55 2 00
Indirect	-	1.80 (1.13, 2.85)
Network	-	1.76 (1.14, 2.72)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	and taken of a	2 64 /1 40 4 945
The line in	0.0	2.54 (1.49, 4.34)
injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network		4.05 (1.90, 8.65)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Direct		1.39 (0.51, 3.82)
Network	- +	0.78 (0.48, 1.25)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
Network	+	1,12 (0.63, 1.98)
injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		4 70 /0 04 0 000
network	T	1.78 (0.81, 3.92)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct	—	1.22 (0.81, 1.83)
Indirect		3.28 (1.56, 6.89)
NEWUR	L	1.44 (1.01, 2.06)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol		1 31 /0 01 169 16
Indirect	—	2.83 (1.35, 5.96)
Network	 →−	2.30 (1.18, 4.49)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct		2 70 /0 07 7 55
Contraction of the second s		0.72 (0.26, 2.04)
Indirect		

Figure 102. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for hypertension (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	0.84 (0.11, 6.57)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_ + _	2.08 (0.25, 17.16)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	—	1.04 (0.08, 13.13)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Network	—	1.27 (0.15, 10.44)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	7.19 (2.83, 18.24) 3.06 (0.00, ∞) 7.18 (1.59, 32.52)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Network	-	1.17 (0.08, 18.30)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		2.00 (0.29, 13.97) 5.16 (0.63, 42.13) 2.48 (0.89, 6.88)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Network	+	1.24 (0.28, 5.56)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 +-	3.64 (0.60, 22.27) 1.01 (0.28, 3.65) 1.50 (0.49, 4.61)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	13.39 (2.01, 89.44) 12.42 (0.91, 168.67) 8.54 (2.12, 34.48)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Network		1.40 (0.09, 20.66)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	→ →	0.56 (0.22, 1.39) 0.22 (0.00, ∞) 0.50 (0.15, 1.66)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ +	0.50 (0.18, 1.41) 1.29 (0.15, 10.74) 0.61 (0.25, 1.45)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	3.45 (0.79, 15.05)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		0.56 (0.04, 8.67)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.21 (0.28, 5.35)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network		6.89 (0.90, 52.70)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	+	1.13 (0.05, 24.38)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		7.55 (0.94, 60.53) 5.21 (0.77, 35.30) 5.68 (1.30, 24.79)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Network	+	0.93 (0.06, 14.27)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	→ →	0.16 (0.02, 1.37) 0.01 (0.00, ∞) 0.16 (0.02, 1.62)
	.1 1 10	

Figure 103. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for headache (all comparisons).

	Comparison		RR (95% CI)
	Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect		1.56 (0.52, 4.74) 1.40 (0.59, 3.31)
	Network Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Direct		1.45 (0.74, 2.81) 1.65 (0.78, 3.48)
	Indirect Network Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment		1.51 (0.60, 3.82) 1.57 (0.80, 3.06)
	Direct Indirect Network		5.00 (0.25, 99.16) 1.32 (0.62, 2.80) 1.35 (0.65, 2.82)
	Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		2.14 (0.52, 8.77)
	Indirect Network		0.94 (0.32, 2.77) 1.62 (0.72, 3.66) 1.41 (0.71, 2.81)
	Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		7.19 (0.37, 138.91) 2.53 (1.04, 6.16) 2.73 (1.15, 6.50)
	Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Network		2.55 (0.43, 14.99)
	Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	1.26 (0.79, 1.99) 0.87 (0.48, 1.58) 1.08 (0.73, 1.61)
	Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	→ →	0.84 (0.63, 1.12) 1.46 (0.66, 3.25) 0.94 (0.66, 1.33)
	Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Naturark		1.26 (0.26, 6.23) 1.90 (0.27, 13.36) 1.48 (0.42, 5.18)
	Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect		0.88 (0.54, 1.42) 1.19 (0.60, 2.33)
	Network Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect		0.98 (0.68, 1.40) 5.63 (0.93, 33.96) 1.34 (0.66, 2.76)
	nnunect Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin		1.34 (0.65, 2.78) 1.89 (1.02, 3.50)
	Urrect – Indirect Network Carbetonin vs Ernometrine+Oxytonin		0.20 (0.01, 4.11) 4.10 (0.57, 29.36) 1.76 (0.33, 9.31)
	Direct Indirect Network		1.41 (0.45, 4.38) 0.68 (0.39, 1.20) 0.86 (0.54, 1.38)
	Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	-	1.36 (0.37, 5.02)
	Indirect Network		0.91 (0.47, 1.76) 0.90 (0.48, 1.68) 0.90 (0.59, 1.38)
	Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		1.74 (0.87, 3.48)
	Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	-	1.63 (0.30, 8.84)
	wisoprosto+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network		2.00 (0.37, 10.79) 1.30 (0.24, 7.13) 1.58 (0.45, 5.58)
	Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network		1.19 (0.71, 1.99) 1.00 (0.58, 1.73) 1.04 (0.66, 1.66)
	Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network		2.02 (1.02, 3.97)
	Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network		1.88 (0.35, 10.25)
	iviisoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		0.66 (0.18, 2.41)
	Network Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	+	1.28 (0.32, 5.15)
	Network Ergometrine vs Misoprostol		1.19 (0.15, 9.54)
	Direct Indirect Network		1.70 (0.70, 4.12) 4.03 (1.35, 12.06) 1.93 (1.09, 3.42)
	Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Network		1.81 (0.34, 9.51)
	injectaole prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect K Network		2.00 (0.39, 10.31) 0.10 (0.00, 2.43) 0.93 (0.18, 4.72)
-		I	

Figure 104. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for fever (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	1.06 (0.51, 2.21)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network		0.74 (0.28, 1.95)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_ -	1.14 (0.36, 3.59)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_	3.33 (1.49, 7.41)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect Network		4.09 (2.01, 8.32) 0.49 (0.00, 202.19) 4.10 (2.09, 8.05)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Network	_	0.82 (0.35, 1.89)
injectable prostagladins vs Placebo or no treatment Network	- _	1.19 (0.30, 4.77)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		1.08 (0.48, 2.43) 0.54 (0.22, 1.32) 0.70 (0.35, 1.42)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	1.58 (0.27, 9.35) 0.77 (0.18, 3.42) 1.07 (0.43, 2.69)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	<u>+</u> +	2.99 (2.00, 4.45) 5.43 (1.48, 19.95) 3.14 (2.20, 4.49)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	3.75 (2.73, 5.15) 6.49 (2.24, 18.76) 3.87 (2.90, 5.16)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 	2.97 (0.97, 9.05) 0.63 (0.35, 1.16) 0.77 (0.44, 1.35)
Injectable prostagladins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		2.00 (0.18, 21.71) 0.96 (0.24, 3.87) 1.12 (0.33, 3.86)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network		1.53 (0.49, 4.75)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ +	2.89 (1.51, 5.54) 6.25 (2.25, 17.35) 4.47 (2.13, 9.41)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	- + - +	5.33 (2.87, 9.88) 5.08 (0.96, 26.84) 5.51 (2.78, 10.92)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	_ _	1.10 (0.48, 2.53)
Injectable prostagladins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	_ _	1.60 (0.40, 6.43)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network		8.50 (1.99, 36.28) 2.01 (0.67, 6.06) 2.92 (1.13, 7.55)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin Direct Indirect Network	→ →	2.55 (1.41, 4.64) 5.07 (1.40, 18.39) 3.60 (1.42, 9.13)
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin Network	_ _	0.72 (0.25, 2.05)
Injectable prostagladins vs Carbetocin Network	_	1.04 (0.23, 4.79)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.97 (0.62, 1.53) 1.33 (0.81, 2.19) 1.23 (0.80, 1.89)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	-	0.25 (0.13, 0.47)
Injectable prostagladins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network		0.36 (0.10, 1.28)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	0.24 (0.17, 0.33) 0.74 (0.09, 6.21) 0.20 (0.12, 0.33)
Injectable prostagladins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network		0.08 (0.01, 0.39) 0.93 (0.18, 4.86) 0.29 (0.09, 0.98)
Injectable prostagladins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network		4.52 (0.76, 26.80) 0.54 (0.07, 4.38) 1.45 (0.42, 5.09)
	I I .1 1 10	

Figure 105. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for shivering (all comparisons).

Network	0.70 (0.41, 1.20)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.05 (0.40.4.00)
Carbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment	0.96 (0.49, 1.89)
Network	0.54 (0.26, 1.11)
Nisoprostor-Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment	2.52 (1.35, 4.71)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment	2.94 (2.38, 3.64)
Indirect Network	- 0.68 (0.00, 189.35) 2.91 (1.78, 4.77)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Network	0.91 (0.49, 1.69)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment	0.35 (0.12, 1.02)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct	0.96 (0.60, 1.53)
Indirect	1.57 (0.90, 2.73) 1.38 (0.86, 2.22)
Carbetocin vs Oxytocin	0.78/0.40 1.23)
Indirect	0.70 (0.45, 1.25) 0.70 (0.31, 1.57) 0.77 (0.46, 1.29)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin	and (array may
Direct -	3.38 (2.50, 4.57) 6.34 (2.26, 17.78)
Network -	3.62 (2.59, 5.05)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct	4.02 (3.23, 4.99)
Network	5.48 (2.47, 12.17) 4.18 (3.34, 5.23)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct	1.73 (0.93, 3.25)
Indirect Antonia	1.24 (0.79, 1.95) 1.31 (0.86, 1.99)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin	
Direct	0.91 (0.11, 7.73) 0.36 (0.11, 1.14)
Network	0.50 (0.19, 1.31)
Carbetocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	0.45 (0.26, 0.80)
Network -	0.56 (0.31, 1.02)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct	2.95 (2.02, 4.29)
Indirect Network	2.46 (1.24, 4.87) 2.63 (1.53, 4.52)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	2.74 (4.05, 9.75)
Indirect	3.48 (1.42, 8.58)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin	
Network	0.95 (0.53, 1.71)
Network	0.36 (0.13, 1.04)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin Direct -	7.83 (3.43, 17.88)
Indirect Metwork	4.21 (2.23, 7.94) 4.68 (2.63, 8.32)
Misoprostol vs Carbetocin	9 46 14 67 7 471
indirect etwork	
Ergometrine vs Carbetocin	(a. 16, a. 16)
Network	1.69 (0.89, 3.21)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Carbetocin Network	0.64 (0.22, 1.91)
Misoprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Direct	0.94 (0.72, 1.22)
Indirect Network	1.18 (0.77, 1.83) 1.16 (0.79, 1.70)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	0.36 (0.21, 0.61)
Network	0.14 (0.05, 0.38)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol	0.34 (0.26, 0.44)
Indirect • •	0.50 (0.11, 2.23) 0.31 (0.22, 0.45)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol	0.04 (0.01 0.21)
Indirect	0.20 (0.07, 0.57) 0.12 (0.05, 0.31)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine	,,
Direct	0.38 (0.16, 0.91) 0.30 (0.07, 1.17)
Network	0.38 (0.15, 1.00)

Figure 106. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for abdominal pain (all comparisons).

nytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		
ect lirect	+	0.89 (0.80, 1.00) 1.25 (0.68, 2.27)
twork	†	1.01 (0.70, 1.44)
gometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment		1 40 (0 83 2 36)
INOIK	ľ	1.40 (0.63, 2.36)
rbetocin vs Placebo or no treatment twork	Ļ	1.14 (0.75, 1.73)
esprestel (Quatesia un Disselle, es se trestment		
twork	+	1.94 (0.82, 4.57)
soprostol vs Placebo or no treatment		
ect	+	0.98 (0.29, 3.37)
twork	Ŧ	1.03 (0.71, 1.50)
pometrine vs Placebo or no treatment		
ect	•	2.05 (1.04, 4.08)
twork	+	2.51 (0.53, 11.85) 2.14 (1.04, 4.41)
ectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment		
twork	+	1.42 (0.40, 5.10)
gometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin		
twork	ľ	1.39 (0.91, 2.13)
rbetocin vs Oxytocin ect	L	1 18 /0 97 1 44\
lirect	f	0.90 (0.44, 1.84)
twork	t	1.13 (0.90, 1.44)
soprostol+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin ect	L	1 03 /1 01 2 571
kirect Karakirekirekirekirekirekirekirekirekirekire		→ 0.90 (0.00, .)
twork	•	1.93 (0.89, 4.20)
soprostol vs Oxytocin	1	0.91 (0.70, 1.05)
lirect	ł	1.17 (0.71, 1.93)
twork	Ť	1.02 (0.80, 1.31)
gometrine vs Oxytocin twork	_	2 13 (0 98 4 63)
		2.13 (0.30, 4.02)
ectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin twork	-	1.41 (0.39, 5.09)
rbatorin vs Ergomatrina+Ovatorin		
ect	•	0.57 (0.36, 0.91)
lirect twork	1	1.11 (0.68, 1.80) 0.81 (0.53, 1.25)
sonrostol+Ovutacin vs. Erromatrina+Ovutacin		·····, ·····,
twork	+	1.38 (0.57, 3.35)
soprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
ect	4	0.90 (0.79, 1.02)
twork	1	0.74 (0.50, 1.08)
gometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
twork	+	1.53 (0.65, 3.60)
ectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin		
twork	+	1.01 (0.27, 3.80)
soprostol+Oxytocin vs Carbetocin		4 70 /0 76 3 0.0
(III)	Γ	1.10 (0.10, 3.84)
soprostol vs Carbetocin ect	•	0.65 (0.52, 0.80)
lirect	1	1.09 (0.79, 1.50)
IWUIK	Ī	0.90 (0.67, 1.22)
gometrine vs Carbetocin twork	•	1.88 (0.84. 4.19)
actable prostaclandine ve Carbetesia		······································
twork	+	1.25 (0.34, 4.55)
soprostol vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
twork	+	0.53 (0.24, 1.20)
gometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin		
twork	+	1.10 (0.37, 3.31)
actable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin	\perp	0 73 /0 46 3 000
UNUR.	T	0.13 (0.16, 3.28)
gometrine vs Misoprostol ect	_	1.58 (0.04, 65.80)
irect	ŧ	1.71 (0.70, 4.19)
WUR		2.08 (0.96, 4.50)
ectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol ect	-	0.99 (0 20 4 80)
 lirect	- <u>[</u> •	3.25 (0.29, 36.07)
	+	1.38 (0.39, 4.90)
twork		
twork sctable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine		1 70 /0 07 40 44
twork :ctable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine ect irect	_ _	1.70 (0.07, 40.44) 0.93 (0.04, 22.45)
Figure 107. Forest plot with relative risk ratios and 95% CIs from pairwise, indirect and network (combining direct and indirect) analyses for diarrhea (all comparisons).

Comparison		RR (95% CI)
Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	1.25 (0.51, 3.07)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	2.25 (0.89, 5.71)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	2.28 (0.87, 6.00)
Misoprostol vs Placebo or no treatment Direct Indirect « Network	+ +	2.80 (1.21, 6.49) 0.50 (0.00, ∞) 2.80 (1.20, 6.49)
Ergometrine vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	3.14 (1.05, 9.36)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Placebo or no treatment Network	+	29.27 (9.57, 89.48)
Ergometrine+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	• •	1.26 (0.72, 2.22) 2.90 (1.49, 5.64) 1.80 (1.18, 2.75)
Misoprostal+Oxytocin vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ -+ +	2.08 (0.99, 4.38) 3.79 (1.19, 12.08) 1.82 (1.12, 2.98)
Misoprostol vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	◆ ★ ◆	2.13 (1.55, 2.93) 3.64 (1.25, 10.56) 2.24 (1.64, 3.05)
Ergometrine vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	3.74 (0.42, 33.53) 2.30 (1.02, 5.18) 2.51 (1.20, 5.26)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	 +	10.38 (1.96, 54.98) 28.82 (12.40, 66.98) 23.41 (11.03, 49.70)
Misoprostol+Oxytocin vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network		0.81 (0.46, 1.41) 2.73 (0.74, 10.05) 1.01 (0.59, 1.72)
Misoprostol vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	• •	1.04 (0.68, 1.57) 3.26 (1.25, 8.49) 1.24 (0.84, 1.84)
Ergometrine vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Network	+	1.39 (0.64, 3.01)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	23.70 (7.55, 74.45) 8.35 (3.13, 22.27) 12.99 (6.16, 27.39)
Misoprastol vs Misoprastol+Oxytocin Direct Indirect Network	•	1.22 (0.70, 2.13) 1.32 (0.52, 3.32) 1.23 (0.76, 1.98)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	•	1.38 (0.60, 3.17)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol+Oxytocin Network	+	12.84 (5.50, 29.96)
Ergometrine vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	• •	1.04 (0.46, 2.34) 1.67 (0.34, 8.08) 1.12 (0.56, 2.25)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Misoprostol Direct Indirect Network	+ +	9.03 (1.70, 48.00) 11.90 (4.95, 28.60) 10.47 (5.02, 21.82)
Injectable prostaglandins vs Ergometrine Direct Indirect Network	+ + +	10.09 (2.75, 37.00) 10.16 (2.88, 35.85) 9.33 (3.94, 22.10)

I I I .1 1 10

Additional data from trialists

First Author	Pub Year	Additional data	
Adanikin	Year 2012	Additional data retrieved from Adanikin A, Orji E, Adanikin P, Olat O. Comparative study of rectal misoprostol to oxytocin in prever postpartum haemorrhage post caesarean section. Internat Journal of Gynecology and Obstetrics 119S3 (2012) S825: Objectives: In patients with risk factors for primary postpa haemorrhage, it is generally considered good practice to admin an adjunctive uterotonic agent after the active management of third stage of labour. Oxytocics that have been used in this adjur context include oxytocin infusion or rectal misoprostol as practiss our centre. Although this practise is popular in our environr objective comparative assessment of these prophylactic measur lacking. This study thus set out to compare the efficacy of measures, the result of which may engender a change in the cu- practice in our centre and elsewhere or indeed strengthe Materials: Oxytocin, Rectal misoprostol. Placebo (Lactose to Normal saline). Methods: In this comparative study, 218 partur who delivered by caesarean section received 5 IU of intrave oxytocin after cord clamping and were further randomized to re either 600mcg rectal misoprostol and a placebo infusion intraven or placebo rectally and an oxytocin infusion. 4 hours post-ope blood loss was estimated by application of pads of known we Results: The mean immediate 4 hours post-operative blood loss not significantly different between the rectal misoprostol and oxy infusion group (106.65±30.64 ml versus 109.02±27.55 ml; p=0 and the change between the pre-operative and postope hematocrit was similar. No patient developed primary postpa haemorrhage in the study. There was no statistically signi difference in the incidence of pyrexia and shivering. Conclus Post-caesarean section rectal misoprostol has comparative effica oxytocin infusion in preventing postpartum haemorrhage	
		temperatures and has as ideal adjunctive ut climate and limited ref the potency of oxytoci	a shelf life of several years should be favoured erotonic in developing countries with a tropical rigeration capabilities that is needed to maintain n.
		Response to email qu	eries:
Al-Sawaf	2013	PPH > 500 ml Control Misoprostol Oxytocin	No. Events Total No. Women 8 39 3 28 2 37
		PPH > 1000 ml Control Misoprostol Oxytocin	No. Events Total No. Women 6 39 2 28 1 37

		Change in Hb after Delivery (g/dl)Mean Hb ChangeSDTotal No. WomenControl1.30.639Misoprostol1.30.928Oxytocin1.20.937
Amin	2014	Response to email queries: Thanks for including my study in urban met analysis. The answers to u r questions are . 1.all pt included in the study were admitted through emergency and ops. After complet history and examination pt with history of privious c . section. ,traumatic ppq. ,bleeding disorders. ,history of prolonged difficult labour, placenta previa, placetal abruption, history of pph. ,multiple gestation and women having BMi more than 30 were excluded. However all other pt with full term pregnancy and who came to labour room in spontaneous onset of labour resulting in spontaneous vaginal delivery without episiotomy were included in the study. 2.as I expand before that high risk pt were not included in study so no death and major morbidity been noted.
Askar	2011	Response to email queries:Hypertension 3rd Stage 30-60 mins3rd Stage 60-120 minsIntervention (Carbetocin)000Control (Syntometrine)77777
Attilakos	2010	Response to email queries:CarbetocinOxytocin1 Nausea2Nausea2 Nausea+Flushed3 Vomiting1 Nausea+Flushed3 Vomiting+Trigeminy1 Nausea+Headache1 Vomiting+Trigeminy1 Nausea+Abdominal pain1 Nausea+Headache2 Nausea+Vomiting2 Nausea+Vomiting1 Nausea+Vomiting+Sweating1 Nausea+Vomiting+SOB1 Nausea+Vomiting+Tremors1 Nausea+Flushed+Tremors1 Nausea+Vomiting+Flushed+Hypotension11 Nausea+Vomiting+Flushed+Tremors1 Tightness throat2 Dizziness2 Dizziness1 Dizziness+Flushed+Sweating1 Flushed2 Hypotension2 Hypotension2 Tremors1 Hypotension+SOB1 SOB1 ST Depression1 Blurred vision1 Tachycardia1 Metallic taste1 Tremors+Tachycardia1 Pain in arm1 Metallic taste+SOB+Wheezing1 Abdominal pain+SOB1 Metallic taste+POF1 Backache1 Headache1 Headachen = 22n = 26

		SOB = Shortness OF E POF = Pressure Over F	Breath Forehead					
		Attachment to response	e to email c	queries	6:			
		Vomiting (generally) Misoprostol Oxytocin	Events 35(6.1) 19(3.3)	Total 569 570				
Atukunda	2014	Vomiting (severe) Misoprostol Oxytocin	Events 8(1.4) 3(0.5)	Total 569 570				
		Morbidity (extensive va Misoprostol Oxytocin	ginal repaiı	r) 1 ⁻ 8	Events 1(1.9) 8(1.4)	6	Total 570 570	
		Response to email que	ries:					
Bambigoye, Hofmeyr	1998	We did not docume management of labour London and Dora Ngin was oxytocin 10u IM. A IM was used in 60/1 used in 85/155. In Nig but we don't have the expected the routine r the randomized groups	ent the ro in each cas iza, Port El at the third s 55 and ox jeria either e details. A nanagemen	butine se. At lizabet site in sytocin oxyto As this nt to b	drugs two site th), and SA (Ro -ergom cin or s was a be ever	used es in So I in Uga ob Ferra etrine ergome a rando nly disti	in the ac outh Africa (anda the rou eira) oxytoci (5u/0.5mg) otrine was u omized trial ributed betw	ctive East utine n 5u was sed, we veen
		Response to email que	ries:					
		Random number tables Fleiss (1981). The first disinterested observer of 100, following in seq	s were used number wa and the nui uence.	d from as sele mbers	the sta ected fro were tl	tistical om the nen allo	text-book by table by a cated in blo	, cks
Begley	1990	Duration 3rd Stage Mins 0-20	0 21-40 41-6	60 61-8	0 81-100	102-120) >120 Mean	
		Intervention (Active) 674 19.62 705	4 11 4	0	2	8	6 11.26	
		Control (Physiological) 670 8.41 724	0 41 7	1	4	1	0 11.56	
		Change in Hb (g/dl)MeIntervention (Active)+0.Control (Physiologocal)+0.	an Change 91 47	SD/0 1.19 1.27	CI Ə 7	Total Nu	Imber of Patie 618 645	nts
		Response to email que	ries:					
Bellad	2012	Four women in the misexperienced fever (defias a dichotomous variation actual temperature temperature of 240° retained placenta and	soprostol gr ned as ?38 able and w (or wheth C). One v a blood tra	roup a 3º C); i e have ner a womar ansfus	nd non this was e no inf ny wo n in th ion; this	e in the s entere formation oman e oxyto s was t	e oxytocin g ed onto the on regarding experienced ocin group he only cas	roup form J the d a had se of

		transfusion and required ICU admission for monitoring. There were no other complications (e.g., organ failure) and no maternal deaths.
		58/329 women receiving oxytocin (17.6%) had second stage of labor >=30 minutes.
		 53/323 women receiving sublingual misoprostol (16.4%) had second stage of labor >=30 minutes. 1 woman receiving oxytocin and no women receiving sublingual
		misoprostol had a third stage of labor >=30 minutes.
5		Response to email queries:
Bhullar	2004	I don't have the raw data anymore, but I am certain we did not have any maternal deaths.
Bugalho	2001	Additional data extracted from published Cochrane review(s)
Chaudhuri	2012	Additional data extracted from published Cochrane review(s)
		Response to email queries:
		You know this was low dose study in low risk cases for prophylaxis. So the answers are:
		The number of women (n/N) in each study group (if any) who needed major surgery - nil
Chhabra	2008	The number of women (n/N) in each study group (if any) who needed ICU admission - nil
		The number of women (n/N) in each study group (if any) who had hyperpyrexia (T>40) - nil
		The number of women (n/N) in each study group (if any) who had vital
		The number of women (n/N) in each study group (if any) who had an estimated blood loss >1000mls - nil
		The number of women (n/N) in each study group (if any) who died - nil
		Response to email queries:
Dansereau	1999	Thank you again for your interest. What I meant to clarify previously is that the paper should have stated that "two patients in each group had a [severe] postpartum hemorrhage [requiring blood transfusion]". Because of the difficulty in assessing estimated blood loss, we had decided -before the beginning of the study- to not use that variable but rather, to use the judgment of the surgeon (blinded to the study drug), as to whether the patient needed additional oxytocic (required in all
		greater than 500 or even 1000 ml. The exact number is not available though as we decided not to use that outcome of PPH in our study.
		Response to email queries:
El Behery	2015	PPH > 500 mlEventsCarbetocin6Oxytocin19

		Major morbidity or death Carbetocin 0 Oxytocin 3 I confirm that we actually excluded cases listed below from our study: congenital fetal anomalies, placenta previa, diabetes, hypertension, preeclampsia, cardiac disorders, general anaesthesia
El Tahan	2012	Response to email queries: I will address below your queries as follows: Any maternal deaths: no Maternal ICU admissions: no Hysterectomies: no Maternal fever >40C: there were 16/179 cases developed pyrexia <40 C in misoprostol group; none exceeded 40C. Blood loss of >1000mls: yes some cases in the placebo group had a total perioperative blood loss >1000 ml
Enakpene	2007	Response to email queries: There was no death recorded in either group None of the study participants required additional surgery such as hysterectomy or arterial ligation to treat massive postpartum hemorrhage. There was only one ICU admission in the misoprostol group for non- hemorrhage related condition but due to postpartum eclampsia. No participants in each study group developed hyperpyrexia of temperature > 40oC No participants developed major organ failure Three participants from the oral misoprostol group had massive postpartum hemorrhage greater than 1000ml while only one participants in the methylergometrine group developed massive postpartum hemorrhage. However, all the four patients who developed massive hemorrhage responded very well with additional oxytocics and did not require surgical interventions.
Fawole	2011	There were no women who experienced hyper-pyrexia (T 40) or vital organ failure, or who needed ICU admission, in either the intervention or control group.
Fenix	2012	Additional data retrieved from an unpublished text entitled "Double- blind randomized controlled trial comparing the effect of carbetocin with oxytocin for the prevention of postpartum hemorrhage among high risk women following vaginal delivery." Results The study was conducted over a 4-month period (from May 2011 to August 2011). There were a total of 272 deliveries in our hospital during the study period, of which, 111 delivered vaginally. 75 women

were finally recruited into the study. Nine women in the carbetocin group and six women in the oxytocin group failed to have a paired hemoglobin test to measure the change in hemoglobin 24 hours after delivery because they refused further blood extraction. These 15 women were excluded, and we therefore had 30 women each in the carbetocin and oxytocin arm in the analysis that was randomly assigned to receive either of the two different interventions.

There was no significant difference between the two groups in their demographic characteristics (Table 1). Most of the participants were college degree holders with an average age of 30 years. The average age of gestation was 38 weeks for the carbetocin group while almost 39 weeks in the oxytocin group. It was also observed that about two thirds were multigravid women for both groups.

The average hemoglobin count 24 hours after delivery of the participants for the oxytocin group (-1.1) seems to have a greater drop than those in the carbetocin group (-0.6) (Table 2).

Participants in the carbetocin group exhibited a relatively lower average estimated blood loss than those in the oxytocin group (296 cc and 493 cc respectively). There was no case of postpartum hemorrhage between the two groups. The distribution of exposure to additional agents revealed that 9 out of 10 patients in the oxytocin group needed additional uterotonic agents. In contrast, 90% of the participants in the carbetocin group did not need any additional agent after drug administration. In addition, it was noted that almost all of the patients in the oxytocin group needed a uterine massage compared to a negligible number of those in the carbetocin group. Meanwhile, none of the patients needed blood transfusion. (Table 3)

Carbetocin immediately (1min) took effect to the patients in the carbetocin group while those patients in the oxytocin group waited for some time (30 min or more) for oxytocin to take effect (Table 3).

Adverse effects are presented in Table 4. The incidences of headache and hypogastric pain were similar in between groups. There were no nausea, vomiting, facial flushing or pain in the injection site noted.

20% percent or 6 out of 30 women in the carbetocin group had tachycardia (defined as maternal pulse ±100) within 60 minutes postdelivery and were significantly higher than the 10% (3 out of 30) recorded in the oxytocin group however, the difference was statistically insignificant. The mean blood pressure values at different intervals after delivery of each group are also shown in Table 4 though no statistical difference was observed between the two interventions.

To determine if there is a significant difference between the two drugs, we will need to perform independent sample T-Test. Prior to performing the test, we need to satisfy its assumptions which is as follows: (a) normality of the data, (b) homogeneity / constancy of variance. (Appendix A).

Based on the results in Table 5, we can conclude that there's a significant difference between the Carbetocin and Oxytocin since the p-values for the Estimated Mean Blood Loss and Mean difference of the Hemoglobin count are approximately zero (< LOS = 0.05).

Looking at the mean difference of the hemoglobin count, having a value of 0.57 implies that carbetocin garnered a significantly lower change in the hemoglobin count after 24 hours.

The mean difference of the estimated blood loss, with value of -197.33, denotes statistically lower blood loss for patients exposed to carbetocin than those who were exposed to oxytocin.

Characteristics		Carbetocin (N = 30)	Oxytocin (N = 30)
Age *		30	30
Age of Gestation *		38.3	38.6
Epidural Analgesia **		100	100
Previous Postpartum Hemorrhage **		6.7	6.7
Augmentation with syntocinon **		76.7	73.3
Episiotomy **		100	100
Normal Vaginal Delivery **		100	100
	College Grad	56.7	73.3
	College Undergrad	26.7	23.3
Educational Level **	High School Grad	3.3	0
	High School UnderGrad	3.3	0
	Post Grad	10	3.3
Oravidity **	Primigravida	33.3	26.7
Gravidity	Multigravida	66.7	73.3

* - Based on Mean ** - Based on Percentages (%)

.

Table 2 Primary outcome (peripartum hemoglobin concentration)

Characteristics	Carbetocin (N = 30)	Oxytocin (N = 30)	Mean Difference
Mean Hemoglobin count on admission (g / dl) *	11.8	12.1	-0.3
Mean Hemoglobin count 24 hrs after delivery (g / dl) *	11.2	11	0.2
Mean fall in hemoglobin (g / dl) *	-0.6	-1.1	0.5

Table 3 Secondary outcomes

Characteristics		Carbetocin (N = 30)	Oxytocin (N = 30)
Estimated Blood Loss *			
Mean Estimated Blood Loss (cc)		296	493.3
Blood loss > 500mL		-	-
Blood loss > 1000mL		-	-
Additional agent **			
Methergin		6.7	90
None		90	0
Oxytocin		3.3	10
Ilterine Massage **	No	90	16.7
oterine mussage	Yes	10	83.3
Blood Transfusion **	No	100	100
Time drug has effected **	Upon Drug Injection	-	6.7
	1 Min	43.3	3.3
	5 Min	30	3.3
	15 Min	3.3	16.7
	30 Min	-	23.3
	1 Hr	-	10
	6 Hr	-	26.7
	24 Hr	23.3	-

*Data are presented as mean (SD). **Data are presented as n (%).

Table 4 Adverse reactions

Characteristics	Carbetocin (N = 30)	Oxytocin (N = 30)
Headache *	3.3	3.3
Hypogastric Pain *	23.3	26.7
Mean systolic blood pressure immediately after delivery **	116.9 (17)	118.2 (14)
Mean diastolic blood pressure immediately after delivery **	66.8 (9.7)	67.5 (7.5)
Mean systolic blood pressure 5 minutes after delivery **	113.8 (9.1)	116.3 (8.5)
Mean diastolic blood pressure 5 minutes after delivery **	64 (5.9)	63.5 (4.9)
Mean systolic blood pressure 30 minutes after delivery **	114.1 (9)	115.8 (9.8)
Mean diastolic blood pressure 30 minutes after delivery **	64.5 (5.9)	65.4 (6.4)
Mean systolic blood pressure 60 minutes after delivery **	114.6 (10.1)	114.1 (12.2)
Mean diastolic blood pressure 60 minutes after delivery **	66.3 (8.2)	65.6 (6.4)
Pulse Rate after delivery **	88.6 (8.8)	82.6 (8.7)
Pulse Rate 30 minutes after delivery **	87.4 (8.6)	83.2 (11.7)
Pulse Rate 60 minutes after delivery **	86.3 (8.2)	84 (10.5)

** - Based on Mean (Std Dev)

Table 5 T-Test for independent samples means

Independent Samples T - Test for Equality of Means						
T Test Statistic Degrees of P- Value Differen						
Difference of Hemoglobin Count	4.99	58	< <mark>0.001</mark>	0.57		
Estimated Blood Loss (cc)	-8.93	58	< <mark>0.001</mark>	-197.33		

Appendix A Q-Q plot of estimated blood loss



Appendix A Q-Q plot of difference of preoperative hemoglobin count and 24 hours hemoglobin count



		Response to email queries:					
		Regarding your query on the incongruity on 30 parturients receiving oxytocin with mean blood loss of 493ml but 0 cases more than 500ml, it was because the estimated blood loss during delivery was measured only through eyeballing of the gauzes used. And in the estimation, we did not include the bleeding coming from repair of the laceration. That is why one of our recommendations for future studies is to measure the actual blood loss using a more accurate device of measurement. And also, since the estimation of blood loss is often inaccurate during delivery, it was agreed that a fall in hemoglobin be used as a primary outcome assessing the efficacy of the uterotonic agents in reducing postpartum hemorrhage.					
		Response to email queries:					
Gavilanes	2015	PPH 500- 1000 mlEventsTotalMisoprostol3350Oxytocin2650					
		PPH > 1000 mlEventsTotalMisoprostol1250Oxytocin1350					
		None of our patients had major morbidity. There were no deaths neither.					
Gulmezoglu	2001	Additional data extracted from published Cochrane review(s)					
		Response to email queries:					
Hofmeyr	1998	$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$					
Hofmeyr	2011	Response to email queries: I've checked the original data: all 9 pyrexias were between 39 and 39.9, none 40 or more.					
		The only severe morbidity we recorded were the 9 laparotomies, of whom one had hysterectomy.					
		There was no overlap of data. The Nigeria site in Hofmeyr 2011 was University College Hospital, Ibadan. Fawole 2011 included two other hospitals in Ibadan and other Nigerian sites. Univ college hospital occurs in the title as that is bukola's base, but was not a site.					
		Additional data also retrieved from Hofmeyr GJ, Gülmezoglu AM, Novikova N, Linder V, FerreiraS, Piaggio G. Misoprostol to prevent and treat postpartum haemorrhage: a systematic review and meta- analysis of maternal deaths and dose-related effects. Bulletin of the World Health Organization 2009;87:666-677.					

		Additional data also retrieved from Hofmeyr GJ, FerreiraS, Nikodem VC, Mangesi L, Singata M, Jafta Z, Maholwana B, Mlokoti Z, Walraven G, Gülmezoglu AM. Misoprostol for treating postpartum haemorrhage: a randomized controlled trial [ISRCTN72263357]. BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth 2004, 4:167.				
		Response to email queries:				
Jerbi	2007	No blood loss more than 1000ml in any group. No transfusion or maternel death in the 2 groups.				
	2006	Response to email queries:				
Lapaire		"Calculated" blood loss: Misoprostol (n=24) Oxytocin (n=19) > 500 ml 18 15 >1000 ml 13 11				
		"Estimated" blood loss: Misoprostol (n=28) Oxytocin (n=28) > 500 ml 18 10 >1000 ml 1 14				
Musa	2015	Response to email queries: There was on postpartum blood loss > 1000ml in both group. Range of blood loss was 20-790ml in misoprostol group and 40-790 in oxytocin group. There was no maternal death recorded though participants were followed up only in the early puerperium. There was no major morbidity. The only morbidity recorded was retained placenta that warranted manual removal of placenta. The two cases occur in oxytocin group and none in misoprostol group.				
		Response to email queries:				
Nasr	2009	Regarding your queries, I write to confirm that NO women in either group needed major surgery or ICU admission, nor did any have hyperpyrexia, massive bleeding over 1000 mL or major organ failure.				
Ortiz- Gomez	2013	Response to email queries:				
		The method of randomisation was made by our Statistical department, and I believe it was a computer-generated sequence.				
	2011	Response to email queries:				
Owonikoko		PPH > 500 mlEventsSublingual Misoprostol34Intravenous Oxytocin27				
		PPH > 1000 mlEventsSublingual Misoprostol4Intravenous Oxytocin5				

		Blood loss (ml) Sublingual Misoprostol Intravenous Oxytocin Change in Hb (%) Sublingual Misoprostol Intravenous Oxytocin	Mean 667.12mls 649.90mls Mean SE 4.5 3.3 4.3 2.9	SD/CI 213.38 251.15 D/CI Tot: 3 50 97 50	Total 50 50 al		
		Response to email queries:					
Parsons	2007	Duration of 3rd Stage >30 MirIntervention3Control2	ns Mean (Mins) S 6.95 6.7 6.18 4.6	SD C 11(SD) 6.13- 62(SD) 5.57-	Cl Total -7.76 (Cl) 218 -6.79(Cl) 222		
		Response to email queries:The data on estimated blood loss is the visually estimated blood loss in the OR. As you can read in the article we believe these data are of limited value and have based our analyses of blood loss on change in Hb instead. A strict perioperative IV fluid protocol was followed, of course.PPH > 500 mlEventsTotal 26 25					
Rosseland	2013	Placebo8PPH > 1000 mlEventsOxytocin0Carbetocin0Placebo0Change in Hb (g/dl)Oxytocin-0.82Carbetocin-0.50Placebo-0.84Change in Hb (%)	25 Total 26 25 25 Mean SE 0.67 26 0.82 25 0.53 25 Mean SE	D/CI Tota	al		
		Oxytocin27.9Carbetocin25.6Placebo15.7	14.1 26 13.6 25 16.5 25				
Sadiq	2011	Response to email queries: For fever, there wasn't any patient lost to follow up because each round of study lasted only 24 hours, and throughout this period, the patients were hospitalized (admitted). For fever, we have full data set, but some of the data were published elsewhere (an act that will probably sound strange to you). There wasn't death in the study (another fact that may probably sound					

		strange, despite the global reports on maternal mortality in Nigeria).				
		There were differences in baseline characteristics like age, parity, etc. however, we thought to have minimize the effects of these differences through randomization of treatment - even though what was done was not the literary meaning of the term 'randomization' since we did not initially consider a specific patient population. However, we suggested further studies (in my reports) whereby baseline characteristics are made uniform between the two groups. In case of baseline treatment with oxytocin; there is clear demarcation in that the Misoprostol group had no pretreatment with oxytocin.				
		Response to email queries:				
Samimi	2013	Because our aim of this study was prevention of PPH not treatment of PPH, therefore we had not mortality or morbidity in our study population, also we used of hemoglobin as indicator of blood loss instead of measurement of blood loss volume.				
		Response to email queries:				
Shrestha	2011	We did not find hyperpyrexia (T>40), vital organ failure, ICU admission, surgery, or who died, in either the intervention or control group of this study.				
Tewatia	2014	Response to email queries:				
		PPH > 500 ml: EventsMisoprostol0Oxytocino				
		PPH > 1000 ml:EventsMisoprostol0Oxytocin0				
		Death:EventsMisoprostol0Oxytocin0				
		Morbidity:EventsMisoprostolfever 13, shivering 10,nausea 1, vomiting 1Oxytocinnausea 1, vomiting 1				
Ugwu	2014	Response to email queries:				
		PPH > 500mlEventTotalMisoprostol1560Oxytocin3360				
		PPH> 1000ml EventTotalmisoprostol160oxytocin260				

		Death Misoprostol Oxytocin	Event 0 0	Total 60 60	
		Morbidity Misoprostol Oxytocin	Events 0 0	Total 60 60	
		Response to email queries:			
Walley	2000	3rd stage >30 misoprostol oxytocin	mins	Mean (mins)SDCI6.153.765.62-6.697.3013.085.40-9.19	
		3rd stage >30 Misoprostol Oxytocin	mins	Events Total 0 194 2 185	
Whigham	2014	Response to email queries:			
		Carbetocin vs oxytocin in non-elective C/S			
		PPH>500ml Carbetocin Oxytocin	Events 42 37	total 59 53	
		PPH>1000ml Carbetocin Oxytocin	Events 6 6	Total 59 53	
		Active labour at time of C/S			
		PPH>500ml Carbetocin Oxytocin	Events 22 19	Total 30 28	
		PPH>1000ml Carbetocin Oxytocin	Events 4 3	Total 30 28	
Zachariah	2006	Response to email queries:			
		We did not have any maternal deaths in any of the study groups.			