Appendix 4: Risk of bias judgements for included studies

Arezzo 2008

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated random code
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Number-coded study medications to the study sites were assigned using an interactive voice-response system
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Blinding was maintained by dispensing pregabalin and placebo in identical capsules
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	The sponsor, members of the study site, and the patients were unaware of the treatment assignment
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Reasons for attrition reported; however, drop-out rates were 34.1% for pregabalin and 28.1% for placebo
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Outcomes reported as specified in methods. BOCF results also reported for pain scores. However, MD and SD for baseline and end-points were not reported separately, and some outcomes were reported at other time points other than at 13 weeks.
Other bias	High risk	All investigators had financial ties to the sponsor

Cardenas 2013

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Interactive response technology system (via phone or internet) provided a unique identification number for each patient
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Both placebo and pregabalin were in the form of gray capsules
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Treatment allocation was concealed from patient and investigator
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Acceptable dropout 15.7% placebo, 17% PGB. Reasons for dropout explained. ITT analysis (and modified ITT analysis) performed
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Following pre-specified outcomes from protocol not reported in study: Modified Brief Pain Inventory Interference Scale; Quantitative Assessment of Neuropathic Pain (QANeP) 6 outcomes; NPSI (9 outcomes)
Other bias	High risk	All the investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Dworkin 2003

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Sequential randomization schedule generated with block size of four. Unclear how this schedule was generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Study medication was packaged and labeled with sequential randomization numbers
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Placebo capsules were identical in appearance to pregabalin; however also states that blinding could have been broken in emergency situations
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Blind maintained until after the study was completed and all decisions regarding data evaluability had been made
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Uneven numbers of drop outs- PGB 35%, placebo 12%. Reasons provided- mostly due to adverse events
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	29 patients had possibly important variations from the protocol and details of this are specified. Secondary outcome of CGIC- mentioned in results that clinicians assessments of global change closely parallelled patients' assessments however no figures given
Other bias	High risk	All the investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Freynhagen 2005

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	All patients received active medication or matching placebo capsules. Double blinded. However, unclear whether they were identical in appearance and taste
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	High rates of dropout: PGB flexible dose 35%, PGB fixed dose 38%, 46%. Reasons provided (mostly due to adverse events for PGB, lack of efficacy for Placebo).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in methods match those found in results.
Other bias	High risk	All study investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Guan 2011

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Double blinded- however insufficient information to determine whether blind could have been broken
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Low numbers of dropout due to adverse events (3% PGB, 5% Placebo), however no information on total numbers of dropout (or other reasons for dropout)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	The weekly mean pain DPRS score was listed as a secondary efficacy outcome in protocol, but included in the primary outcomes in publication. Also, final report introduced DAAC (Duration-adjusted average change score) as a primary outcome
Other bias	High risk	All study investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Holbech 2015

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated randomization
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomization plan was generated by a person at a pharmacy not otherwise involved in the trial; Sealed, opaque envelopes used in emergency situations.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Double-blinded (patients, investigators and all other staff). Identical tablets.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Patients, investigators, and all other staff involved in the conduct of the trial were blinded to individual treatment assignments for the duration of the study.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Acceptable numbers of drop out (5% placebo, 17% pregabalin). Reasons provided (withdrawn consent, adverse events)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	All but 2 of the secondary outcomes in the protocol have been omitted and re-analysed as "expoloratory" outcomes in the final analysis.
Other bias	High risk	Majority of trial investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Huffman 2015

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated codes
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not decribed
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Drop-out rates notsignificantly different between groups. Reasons for drop-outs specified
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes reported as specified in protocol
Other bias	High risk	All authors have, or have had financial ties to pharmaceutical industry

Kanodia 2011

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	States that it is a double blind trial, but there are no details of how this was performed (or who was blinded).
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	No details given about whether there was attrition or explanation.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Pre-specified outcomes in methods match those found in results. Poor reporting of outcomes from each intervention group
Other bias	Unclear risk	Very small sample size

Kim 2011

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer generated schedule
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised telerandomisation system (IMPALA)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Matching placebo; double-blinded; unclear whether dientical in appearance
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Acceptable rates of drop out (15% pregabalin, 17% placebo). Reasons for discontinuation provided. ITT analysis performed
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Daily Sleep interference scale (DSIS) omited as a secondary outcome.
Other bias	High risk	All study authors except one had financial ties to the study sponsor

Krcevski Škvarč 2010

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	High rates of attrition (64% pregabalin, 40% placebo). Reasons for study discontinuation provided. ITT analysis performed and reported.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the methods match those reported in the results
Other bias	Unclear risk	Some differences in baseline characteristics; proportion taking antiviral therapy higher in pregabalin group, differences in distribution of zoster and severirty of rash. The study authors had no competing interests

Lesser 2004

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information as to how it was generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Code was maintained by the Clinical Pharmacy Operations department, with no access by other individuals or departments. Medication was shipped to the sites in blocks in unit-dose trays. Each patient was assigned the next sequential random number
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Each patient took one small and two larger capsules, with the proper mix of active medication and placebo, for each dose to achieve double-blinding. Does not specify that the active intervention and placebo were identical
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Blinding was maintained until all decisions regarding data evaluability were made
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Low drop out rates (8% placebo, 11% PGB). Only states that 18/35 dropouts were due to adverse events.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Pre-specified outcomes in methods match those found in results.
Other bias	High risk	Baseline characteristics: more people in placebo group taking antidiabetic medication (insulin) compared to PGB group. More T1DM and T2DM in placebo group. The study authors had financial ties to the sponsor.

Liu 2015

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Interactive voice response system
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Placebo was matched to pregabalin. Not specified whether active and placebo pills were identical in appearance
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Acceptable drop out rates (12% pregabalin, 16% placebo). Reasons for withdrawal provided. ITT analysis performed.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Omitted pre-specified secondary outcomes relating to the HADS Anxiety and Depression score.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Two authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

Mathieson 2017

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-derived random-number sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Packaged in white, opaque, sealed containers
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Pregabalin capsules and matching placebo capsules. Unclear whether they were identical in appearance
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Some outcomes were assessed by means of telephone contact with the patients by trained trial researchers, but reports that all the research staff, statisticians, trial clinicians, and patients were unaware of the trial-group assignments during recruitment, data collection, and analysis.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Acceptable number of drop outs (16% pregabalin, 14% placebo). Reasons provided. ITT analysis performed (although it did not include 2 randomised patients).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	The primary outcome was measured at fewer time points than was specified in the protocol which specified pain intensity would be measured at baseline then weeks 2,4,8,12,26 and 52. Study reported pain only at weeks 8, 52. All other outcomes remained the same as pre-specified.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Some differences in baseline characteristics, such as sex, dermatomal pain, neurologic deficit, clinically suspected level of spine associated with leg pain, and PainDETECT scores. Three authors had financial ties to the pharmaceutical industry

Moon 2010

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computerized tele-randomization system
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central web–telephone software
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Mentions double-blinded; "pregabalin and matching placebo"
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Study report does not specify, although protocol states that the outcome assessors were blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Uneven numbers of drop out (14.8% pregabalin, 20.5% placebo), however reasons for drop out provided. ITT analysis performed and reported.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All pre-specified outcomes in protocol reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	The authors fail to declare whether they had financial ties to Pfizer.

Rauck 2013

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Drug containers of identical appearance
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	PGB was provided with identical-inappearance placebo capsules to ensure blinding of subjects and investigators. All tablets were provided by an unblinded, third-party pharmacist.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Study does not provide sufficient information, although trial protocol does state that the outcome assessors were blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Reasons for dropout reported although attrition rates were 29% for pregabalin and 25% for placebo.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Reports all pre-specified outcomes from the protocol.
Other bias	High risk	The authors had financial ties to the sponsor

Richter 2005

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	computer generated sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Study capsules were identical (doses were also matched to size of tablets for both pregabalin and placebo)
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Blind was maintained until completion of study and data evaluability determination however does not specify whether outcome assessors or other investigators were blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Acceptable attrition rates (15% placebo, 5% PGB 150mg/d, 12% PGB 600mg/d [overall 9% pregabalin]). Reasons for drop out provided.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the Methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	High risk	Two-thirds of the authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

Rosenstock 2004

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Sequential randomization numbers according to a randomization schedule designed to attain an even distribution between pregabalin and placebo. Unclear how this sequence was generated.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Study medication was packaged and labeled with sequential randomization numbers.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	All medications were packaged in blinded fashion. Not specified whether the active intervention and placebo were identical in appearance
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Acceptable attrition rates (14% pregabalin, 11% placebo). Reasons for withdrawal provided. ITT analysis performed.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the Methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	Unclear risk	The authors did not state whether they had any competing interests

Sabatowski 2004

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated code
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Study medication was packaged and labeled with sequential randomisation numbers
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	All medications were blinded and taken orally. Placebo capsules were identical in appearance to capsules containing active drug. However, an investigator could break the randomisation code and, thus, the blind for a patient if a medical emergency occurred.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Reasons for dropout provided, however unequal attrition rates across the groups (12.3% PGB 150mg/d, 21.1% PGB 300mg/d, Overall PGB 16.6%, 24.7% Placebo). Both ITT and PPA reported but ITT value used in abstract.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Results of CGIC are not reported, just states that it shows a "statistically significant improvement".
Other bias	High risk	Majority of the investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Satoh 2011

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	Allocation based on the results of a laboratory test (CrCl)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centrally organised using a validated web-based system.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Unequal dropout across the groups (11.8% placebo, 14.7% 300 mg/day PGB, 28.9% in the 600 mg/day PGB). All reasons for attrition were not provided.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Secondary outcome added in published study: patient impression of subjective symptoms (including numbness, pain and paraesthesia) which showed favourable results for pregabalin.
Other bias	High risk	All authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

Shabbir 2011

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Appears to be no attrition from either of the randomised groups.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	High risk	Baseline characteristics table not provided to compare across the intervention arms. Pregabalin was administered twice daily; daily frequency of placebo administration not specified. The authors did not state whether they had any competing interests

Siddall 2006

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer generated
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Study medication was packaged and labeled with sequential randomization numbers according to the randomization schedule
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Medication was blinded by using capsules of identical size, color, taste, and smell for placebo and pregabalin
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	High (and uneven) attrition rates: pregabalin 30%, placebo 45%. Reasons for withdrawal provided. ITT analysis results reported.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the Methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	High risk	All trial investigators had financial ties to the study sponsor

Simpson 2010

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Computer-generated sequence
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central computerized telerandomization system, ensured that investigators remained blinded to treatment assignments during the study
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Study drug and placebo were identical in appearance in order to preserve blinding.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Study does not provide sufficient information, although trial protocol does state that the outcome assessors were blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Similar rates of attrition (21% pregabalin, 19% placebo). Reasons for drop out provided, however not all randomised patients are included in the ITT analysis.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Prespecified outcomes (assessing QANeP) omitted in final study. Safety outcomes not prespecified in protocol added to final study.
Other bias	High risk	All trial investigators had, or have had finantial ties to the study sponsor

Simpson 2014

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Computer generated "pseudorandom" code
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Automated telerandomization system.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Patients were randomised in a double blind fashion through study sponsors sysetm for randomization and dispensing.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Participants, investigators and study sponsor personnel were blinded to interventions after treatment assignment, but unclear whether this includes outcome assessors.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	High risk	Reasons provided for drop outs though there is a high attrition rate (31% pregabalin, 31% placebo).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the protocol match those reported in the study.
Other bias	High risk	Study prematurely terminated by Pfizer following unfavourable results. All trial investigators had finantial ties to the study sponsor

Stacey 2008

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information; reports double-blinded but unclear who is blinded.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	Rates of attrition are not comparable across the groups (5.5% flexible dose PGB, 20.5% fixed dose PGB, 16.7% Placebo). Reasons for drop out provided.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	High risk	All authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

Tolle 2008

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Similar attrition rates across the groups (Placebo 17.7%, PGB 150mg/d 17.2%, PGB 300mg/d 20.2%, PGB 300/600mg/d 22.8%). Reasons for withdrawal provided. ITT analysis performed and reported.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	EuroQoL Health Utilities Index not reported in final results (although mentioned in the abstract and methods).
Other bias	High risk	All authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

van Seventer 2006

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information although states double-blinded.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Unclear risk	High attrition rates across the groups (36.6% placebo, 29.9% PGB 150mg/d, 36.7% PGB 300mg/d, 36.6% PGB 300/600mg/d). Reasons for withdrawal provided. ITT analysis performed.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	High risk	All study authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

van Seventer 2010

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	An Interactive Voice Recognition System was used.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Medication was blinded by using capsules of identical size, color, taste and smell for placebo, and pregabalin.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Low risk	Trial protocol specifies that outcome assessor was blinded.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Reasons for discontinuation provided, attrition rates comparable across the groups- 24.4% for pregabalin, 22.8% for placebo. ITT analysis performed (although excluded one patient from each group due to lack of post-baseline data).
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Protocol specified CGIC a secondary outcome however this was omitted in published report. Other omitted outcomes include Pain Treatment Satisfaction Scale (PTSS)- Impact of current pain medication, satisfaction with current pain medication, medication characteristics, efficacy; Neuropathic Pain Symptom Inventory total intensity score, Medical Outcome Study Cognitive Subscale (reasoning, concentration, confusion, memory, attention, thinking); Davidson Trauma scale (severity, frequency, total score).
Other bias	High risk	All study authors had financial ties to the study sponsor

Vranken 2008

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomized according to the automated assignment system
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Hospital pharmacist prepared identical, coded medication bottles containing identical capsules of pregabalin or placebo. Unclear if pharmacist was otherwise involved in the study or third party.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	Coded medication bottle was supplied by hospital pharmacist to the blinded treating physician. Medication bottle contained identical capsules.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient information
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	Reasonable rates of attrition (15% pregabalin, 20% of placebo). Reasons for discontinuation provided.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes specified in the methods match those reported in the results.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Some differences in baseline characteristics including site of pain and concomitant therapies. The authors did not report whether they had any competing interests