

**PICO 7****Review information****Authors**the Danish Health Authority<sup>1</sup><sup>1</sup>[Empty affiliation]

Citation example: tDHA. PICO 7. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

**Characteristics of studies****Characteristics of included studies****Markman 2015**

<b>Methods</b>	
<b>Participants</b>	
<b>Interventions</b>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	
<b>Notes</b>	

**Risk of bias table**

<b>Bias</b>	<b>Authors' judgement</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No info
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Low risk	

**Yaksi 2007**

<b>Methods</b>	
<b>Participants</b>	
<b>Interventions</b>	
<b>Outcomes</b>	
<b>Notes</b>	

**Risk of bias table**

<b>Bias</b>	<b>Authors' judgement</b>	<b>Support for judgement</b>
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	n
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	n
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	n
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	High risk	
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	
Other bias	Unclear risk	n

Footnotes

**References to studies****Included studies****Markman 2015**

[Empty]

**Yaksi 2007**

[Empty]

## Excluded studies


## Data and analyses

## 1 Medicin for neurogene smerter samt smertestillende vs. smertestillende

Outcome or Subgroup	Studies	Participants	Statistical Method	Effect Estimate
1.3 Smerter	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.3.1 Smerter (0-12 uger)	2	107	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.14 [-0.82, 0.54]

## Figures

Figure 1 (Analysis 1.1)




Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)  
(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)  
(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)  
(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)  
(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)  
(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)  
(G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Pico 7, outcome: 1.1 Funktionsevne.

Figure 2 (Analysis 1.2)




Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)  
(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)  
(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)  
(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)  
(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)  
(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)  
(G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Pico 7, outcome: 1.2 Gangdistance.

Figure 3 (Analysis 1.3)




Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Risk of bias legend

- (A) Random sequence generation (selection bias)  
(B) Allocation concealment (selection bias)  
(C) Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)  
(D) Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)  
(E) Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)  
(F) Selective reporting (reporting bias)  
(G) Other bias

Forest plot of comparison: 1 Pico 7, outcome: 1.3 Smerter.

Figure 4 (Analysis 1.4)



Forest plot of comparison: 1 Pico 7, outcome: 1.4 Cerebrale bivirkninger.