Comparison 1: Wound protector device vs. conventional wound protection

Quality assessment							№ of patients		Effect		Quality
№ of studies	**Study design**	**Risk of bias**	**Inconsistency**	**Indirectness**	**Imprecision**	**Other considerations**	**Wound protector device**	**No wound protector**	**Relative (95% CI)**	**Absolute (95% CI)**	
Surgical site infections: all studies											
11	RCTs	Serious [1]	Serious [2]	Not serious	Not serious	Publication bias strongly suspected [5]	190/1471 (12.9%)	321/1478 (21.7%)	**OR: 0.42** (0.28-0.62)	**113 fewer per 1000** (from 70 fewer to 145 fewer)	⊕◯◯◯ VERY LOW
Surgical site infections: single-ring wound protector only											
6	RCTs	Serious [1]	Serious [3]	Not serious	Not serious	None	178/1086 (16.4%)	274/1108 (24.7%)	**OR: 0.51** (0.34-0.76)	**104 fewer per 1000** (from 47 fewer to 147 fewer)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW
Surgical site infection: double-ring wound protector only											
5	RCTs	Serious [1]	Not serious	Not serious	Serious [4]	None	12/385 (3.1%)	47/370 (12.7%)	**OR: 0.25** (0.13-0.50)	**92 fewer per 1000** (from 59 fewer to 108 fewer)	⊕⊕◯◯ LOW

1. Risk of selection bias.
2. High heterogeneity, I^2 =60%.
3. High heterogeneity, I^2 =70%.
4. Optimal information size not met.
5. Although not a large number of studies, there is a considerable asymmetry in the funnel plot.

SSI: surgical site infection; RCT: randomized controlled trial; OR: odds ratio; CI: confidence interval.