Comparison 2: Proteolytic enzymes compared with placebo

Comparison 2a: Oral protease complex compared with placebo

Source: Zakarija-Grkovic I, Stewart F. Treatments for breast engorgement during lactation. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020;(9):CD006946.

Certainty assessment							Nº of patients		l	Effect		
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Oral protease complex	Placebo	Relative (95% CI)	Absolute (95% CI)	Certainty (GRADE)	Importance

Breast pain (no improvement)

ſ	1	randomized trials	very serious ^a	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	2/35 (5.7%)	8/24 (33.3%)	RR 0.17 (0.04 to 0.74)	277 fewer per 1000	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
		undis	senous							(0.04 (0 0.74)	(from 320 fewer to		
											87 fewer)		

Breast swelling (no improvement)

Ī	1	randomized trials	very serious ^a	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	6/35 (17.1%)	12/24 (50%)	RR 0.34 (0.15 to 0.79)	330 fewer per 1000 (from 425 fewer to	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
											105 fewer)		

Number of women with adverse effects

2	randomized trials	very serious ^c	not serious	not serious	very serious ^d		Adverse effects were measured and reported in the studies investigating serrapeptase (Kee 1989) and protease (Murata 1965). No women in any of the groups experienced adverse events.	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
---	----------------------	------------------------------	-------------	-------------	------------------------------	--	---	------------------	----------

CI: confidence interval; RR: risk ratio.

a. The pooled effect provided by study "C".

b. Small sample size and/or few events.

c. Most of the pooled effect provided by studies "B" or "C" but with a substantial proportion (i.e. > 50%) from studies "C".

d. No meta-analysis done. No events reported.

Comparison 2b: Oral serrapeptase compared with placebo

Source: Zakarija-Grkovic I, Stewart F. Treatments for breast engorgement during lactation. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2020;(9):CD006946.

			Certainty asses	ssment			Nº of p	atients	E	ffect	Certainty	
Nº of studies	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Other considerations	Oral serrapeptase	Placebo	Relative (95% Cl)	Absolute (95% CI)	(GRADE)	Importance

Breast pain (no improvement)

1	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	very serious ^{b,c}	none	5/35 (14.3%)	9/35 (25.7%)	RR 0.56 (0.21 to 1.49)	113 fewer per 1000 (from 203 fewer to 126 more)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
---	----------------------	----------------------	-------------	-------------	--------------------------------	------	--------------	--------------	----------------------------------	--	------------------	----------

Breast swelling (no improvement)

1	randomized trials	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	very serious ^{b,c}	none	9/35 (25.7%)	12/35 (34.3%)	RR 0.75 (0.36 to 1.55)	`	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
										189 more)		

Breast engorgement (symptoms not subsided after 3 days of treatment)

1	randomized	serious ^a	not serious	not serious	serious ^b	none	5/35 (14.3%)	14/35 (40.0%)	RR 0.36	256 fewer per	$\oplus \oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$	CRITICAL
	trials								(0.14 to 0.88)	1000	LOW	
										(from 344 fewer to		
										48 fewer)		

Number of women with adverse effects

2	randomized serious ^d trials	not serious	not serious	very serious ^e		Adverse effects were measured and reported in the studies investigating serrapeptase (Kee 1989) and protease (Murata 1965). No women in any of the groups experienced adverse events.	⊕○○○ VERY LOW	CRITICAL
---	---	-------------	-------------	------------------------------	--	---	------------------	----------

CI: confidence interval; RR: risk ratio.

a. The pooled effect provided by study "B".

b. Small sample size and/or few events.

c. Wide confidence interval crossing the line of no effect.

d. Most of the pooled effect provided by studies "B" or "C" but with a substantial proportion (i.e. > 50%) from studies "C".

e. No meta-analysis done. No events reported.