

Table S2. Results of risk of bias assessment for studies evaluating antiseptics for vascular catheter insertion.

Study	Randomisation	Allocation concealment	Blinding of intervention	Blinding of outcome assessment	Incomplete outcome data	Selective reporting	Study groups equal at baseline	Other bias	Ratings summary	Overall risk of bias
Maki et al. 1991 [28]	B	B	C	A	B	A	C	C	2 A, 3 B, 3 C	Moderate
Sheehan et al. 1993 [29]	B	B	C	B	A	A	A	B	3 A, 4 B, 1 C	Moderate
Meffre et al. 1996 [31]	B	B	C	B	A	A	C	B	2 A, 4 B, 2 C	Moderate
Mimoz et al. 1996 [32]	A	A	C	A	B	A	C	A	5 A, 1 B, 2 C	Low
Legras et al. 1997 [33]	B	B	C	B	A	A	A	A	4 A, 3 B, 1 C	Low
Cobbett and LeBlanc 2000 [34]	B	B	C	B	B	C	A	A	2 A, 4 B, 2 C	Moderate
Humar et al. 2000 [35]	A	A	C	A	A	A	A	A	7 A, 0 B, 1 C	Low
Maki et al. 2001 [36]	B	B	C	A	A	A	B	B	3 A, 4 B, 1 C	Moderate
Langgartner et al. 2004 [37]	B	A	C	B	B	B	A	A	3 A, 4 B, 1 C	Moderate
Astle and Jensen 2005 [38]	B	B	C	B	B	C	A	A	2 A, 4 B, 2 C	Moderate
Kelly et al. 2005 [39]	B	B	C	B	B	A	A	B	2 A, 5 B, 1 C	Moderate
Mimoz et al. 2007 [41]	A	A	C	A	A	A	B	A	6 A, 1 B, 1 C	Low
Small et al. 2008 [42]	B	B	C	B	B	A	B	C	1 A, 5 B, 2 C	High
Vallés et al. 2008 [43]	B	A	C	A	B	A	C	C	3 A, 2 B, 3 C	Moderate
Garland et al. 2009 [44]	B	B	C	B	A	A	A	A	4 A, 3 B, 1 C	Low

Notes. Bias rankings: A, low risk of bias; B, uncertain risk of bias; C, high risk of bias. The overall risk of bias was judged by the authors, taking into account the relative importance of the criteria.