Systematic Review & Meta-Analysis

Comparison of analgesic effects of pericapsular nerve group block and fascia iliaca compartment block during hip arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials

Jay Prakash, Bram Rochwerg¹, Khushboo Saran², Arun K. Yadav³,

Pradip Kumar Bhattacharya, Amit Kumar⁴, Dipayan Chaudhuri¹, Shio Prive⁵

Department of Critical Care Medicine, ⁴Laboratory Medicine and ⁵Superspeciality Anaesthesia, Rajendra

Institute of Medical Sciences, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India, ¹Department of Medicine (Division of Critical Care),

McMaster University, Hamilton, Ontario, Canada, ²Department of Pathology, Gandhi Nagar Hospital, Central

Coalfield, Kanke, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India, ³Department of Community Medicine, Armed Forces Medical

Address for correspondence:

Dr. Jay Prakash, Department of Critical Care Medicine, Rajendra Institute of Medical Sciences, Ranchi, Jharkhand, India. E-mail: dr.jay_prakash@ rediffmail.com

> Submitted: 13-Jul-2023 Revised: 22-Aug-2023 Accepted: 08-Sep-2023 Published: 07-Nov-2023

Access this article online

Website: https://journals.lww.

DOI: 10.4103/ija.ija_672_23

Quick response code

962

com/ijaweb

ABSTRACT

College, Pune, Maharashtra, India

Background and Aims: Postoperative pain for patients having hip arthroplasty ranges from moderate to severe. Many regional anaesthesia procedures treat postoperative pain to improve functional ability and quality of life. Evidence comparing the analgesic effects of the pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block and fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB) remains unclear. The analgesic efficacies of PENG and FICB in hip arthroplasty were compared to determine which technique is associated with superior analgesia. Methods: The electronic databases (PubMed, Cochrane Library, Google Scholar and Web of Sciences) were searched for published randomised controlled trials (RCTs) till 5 April 2023 comparing PENG block vs. FICB following hip arthroplasty. The primary outcome was pain scores [numerical rating scale (NRS) or visual analogue scale (VAS)] between 0 and 10 at rest and during movement at 24 h. Secondary outcomes included pain scores at rest and during movement within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h, time to first rescue analgesia and cumulative postoperative opioid use in 24 h. We assessed the risk of bias using the Cochrane Collaboration Risk-of-Bias 2 tool. Using Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development, and Evaluation (GRADE), the certainty of the evidence was assessed. Subgroup analysis was performed to explore the source of heterogeneity. Results: We included 12 RCTs examining 644 patients. Pain scores at rest at 24 h (standardised mean differences (SMDs): 0.17; 95% confidence interval (CI): -0.90 to 1.23; P = 0.76, moderate certainty) and during movement at 24 h (SMD: -0.58, 95% CI: -1.53 to 0.38, P = 0.24, moderate certainty) were not different in both PENG block and FICB. Pain scores at rest and during movement within 30 min may be lower with PENG block than FICB. However, the pain score at rest and during movement at 6 h and the time to first rescue analgesia were not different between the two treatment arms. The mean opioid consumption in oral morphine equivalents (mg) in 24 h may be lower with PENG than FICB. Conclusion: We observed no difference between the PENG block and the FICB at 24 h for pain at rest and movement with a moderate degree of certainty. However, PENG block showed improved analgesia within 30 min at rest and during movement, and reduce postoperative opioid consumption in 24 h with moderate certainty of evidence. Further large-scale and high-quality RCTs are required to supplement the present findings.

Keywords: Analgesia, fascia iliaca compartment block, hip arthroplasty, nerve block, pain, pericapsular nerve group

This is an open access journal, and articles are distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 License, which allows others to remix, tweak, and build upon the work non-commercially, as long as appropriate credit is given and the new creations are licensed under the identical terms.

For reprints contact: WKHLRPMedknow_reprints@wolterskluwer.com

How to cite this article: Prakash J, Rochwerg B, Saran K, Yadav AK,

Bhattacharya PK, Kumar A, et al. Comparison of analgesic effects

of pericapsular nerve group block and fascia iliaca compartment

block during hip arthroplasty: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. Indian J Anaesth 2023;67:962-72.

INTRODUCTION

Postoperative pain for patients having hip arthroplasty ranges from moderate to severe.^[1] Various studies reported the increased risk of perioperative difficulties and their negative impact on long-term prognosis. Many regional anaesthesia procedures treat postoperative pain to improve functional ability and quality of life. In 1989, Dalens and colleagues first described the fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB), which blocks the femoral nerve (FN), obturator nerve (ON) and lateral femoral cutaneous nerve (LCN) of the thigh at the same time.^[2] The FICB, one of many localised analgesic procedures, is favoured by anaesthesiologists to provide acute and postoperative analgesia for hip fractures.^[3] Recently, Girón-Arango *et al.*^[4] described the pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block as an alternative regional anaesthesia technique to manage acute pain following a hip fracture. PENG acts by blocking the FN, ON and accessory ON (AON), where a local anaesthetic is injected into the myofascial plane located between the psoas muscle anteriorly and the pubic ramus posteriorly.^[4]

Evidence comparing the analgesic effects of these techniques remains unclear. Numerous studies demonstrated that PENG block provided a better analgesic effect than FICB.^[5-13] Recently, one study found that PENG block may have equivalent analgesic effects to FICB^[14]; however, another study found that the analgesic effect was lower with FICB at different time intervals, while no intergroup differences were seen at other time intervals.^[15] These issues challenge clinicians trying to use the best evidence to guide their clinical practice. We performed a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) to compare the efficacy of PENG versus (vs.) FICB for patients undergoing hip arthroplasty.

METHODS

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) guidelines^[16] were followed while conducting this study, which was registered prospectively in International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) (CRD42022336392). At the time of protocol registration, there were no primary time points for pain scores, but following a literature search, we decided that the time point of 24 h is clinically relevant for both pain scores and opioid consumption. We also planned to perform subgroup analyses based on the type of FICB and type of surgeries.

Literature search

A systematic search was performed in electronic databases including PubMed (Medical Literature Analysis and Retrieval System Online (MEDLINE)), Web of Sciences (Clarivate Analytics), Cochrane Library of Controlled Trials and Google Scholar from inception until 5 April 2023. For unpublished data on ClinicalTrials.gov, ctri.nic.in and the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) enquiries were done through mail. We searched using keywords, controlled vocabulary (Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)) and Boolean operators such as "hip surgery or hip arthroplasty," "pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block," and "fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB)." Furthermore, we manually searched the citations of the selected studies to identify any additional eligible studies. Supplementary Table 1 displays the search terms. Full reports of RCTs were identified in which PENG block and FICB were compared for hip arthroplasty. The criteria for inclusion and exclusion were established a priori. We included only RCTs published in English; patients who underwent hip surgery and were over the age of 18 years and reported any clinical outcomes of interest. We excluded case reports, case series, review articles, comments, letters to the editor, abstracts and conference presentations.

Population—patients undergoing hip arthroplasty (any type of hip surgery).

Intervention—PENG block.

Comparator—FICB.

Outcomes—our primary outcome was the pain score (1–10) as measured by the numeric rating scale (NRS) or visual analogue scale (VAS) at rest and during movement at 24 h, which was clinically important. However, we also captured pain scores at rest and during movement within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h, as well as time to first rescue analgesia (hours) and consumption of cumulative oral equivalents of morphine (milligram) 24 h postoperatively.

Assessment of the methodological quality

We assessed the risk of bias using the Cochrane Collaboration Risk-of-Bias 2 tool^[17] in duplicate (JP and AKY) to evaluate the methodological quality of each included RCT. We assessed the risks associated with selection bias (such as randomised sequence generation and allocation concealment), performance and detection bias (such as blinding), attrition

					Table 1: Characteris	stics of included tr	ials		
Reference	Country	Group	Block p	erformed	Local anaesthetic given	Mode of	Types of	Postoperative	Primary outcome
		(number)	PENG	le, volume) FICB		anaesmesia	surgery	anaigesia	
Aliste 2021 ^[15]	Chile	PENG (20) FICB (20)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided suprainguinal FICB, 40 ml	0.5% levobupivacaine with epinephrine 5 mcg/ ml/0.25% levobupivacaine with epinephrine 5 mcg/ml	Spinal anaesthesia before block (i.e. 2 mL of bupivacaine heavy 0.5%) and	ТНА	Intravenous morphine	Incidence of quadriceps Motor block (at 6 h) Secondary outcomes included static (at rest) and dynamic (with hip
Choi 2022 ^[14]	Korea	PENG (27) FICB (27)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided suprainguinal FICB, 30 ml	Ropivacaine 0.2% with epinephrine 1:200,000 (5 µg/ml)/ropivacaine 0.2% with epinephrine1:200,000	20 µg of fentanyl General anaesthesia before block	ТНА	Intravenous fentanyl (converted to equivalent	adduction) NRS scores NRS scores at rest and during 45° passive flexion of the hip up to 48 h following surgery
Jadon 2021™	India	PENG (33) FICB (33)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided suprainguinal FICB, 20 ml	(b) µg/ml) 0.25% bupivacaine/0.25% bupivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block (1.8 ml bupivacaine (heavy) 0.5%- and 0.4-ml fentanyl (20 ud)	Positioning	morprine) Intravenous paracetamol	NRS at rest and on passive 15° limb lifting 30 minutes after the block and ease of spinal positioning
Mosaffa 2022 ^{®]}	Iran	PENG (30) FICB (22)	USG-guided PENG, 3 ml/kg	USG-guided infrainguinal FICB, 3 ml/kg (maximum of 40 ml)	0.5% ropivacaine/0.5% ropivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block	DHS fixation, gamma nail and screw fixation	Intravenous morphine	Evaluation of PENG in comparison with FICB in terms of VAS score
Natrajan 2022 ^{®]}	India	PENG (12) FICB (12)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided infrainguinal FICB, 20 ml	0.5% ropivacaine/0.5% ropivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block	DHS fixation or hemiarthroplasty	Intravenous paracetamol	Evaluation of efficacy of postoperative analgesia in PENG versus FICB in terms of NRS score
Hua 2022 ^[5]	China	PENG (24) FICB (24)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided infrainguinal FICB, 30 ml	0.4% ropivacaine/0.4% ropivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block 2–2.5 mL of 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride heavy	Hemiarthroplasty or THA	Intravenous sufentanil	Evaluation of efficacy of postoperative analgesia in PENG versus FICB in terms of static and dynamic VAS score
Senthil 2022 ^[9]	India	PENG (20) FICB (20)	USG-guided PENG, 30 ml	USG-guided infrainguinal FICB, 30 ml	0.25% levobupivacaine and 4 mg dexamethasone/0.25% levobupivacaine with 4 mg dexamethasone	Spinal anaesthesia after block 3–3.5 mL of 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride heavy	DHS fixation and proximal femur nailing	Intravenous fentanyl	Evaluation of efficacy of postoperative analgesia in PENG versus FICB in terms of VAS score
Kulkarni 2022 ^[23]	India	PENG (30) FICB (30)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided suprainguinal FICB, 20 ml	0.25% bupivacaine/0.25% bupivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block	Positioning	Not specified	Assessment of pain using NRS score before, after and during placement in sitting position
Shankar 2020 ^[10]	India	PENG (30) FICB (30)	USG-guided PENG, 25 ml	USG-guided suprainguinal FICB, 25 ml	0.25% ropivacaine/0.25% ropivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block 3 mL of 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride heavy	Positioning	Intravenous tramadol	Assessment of pain using VAS score before and after block and postoperative analgesia
Kalashetty 2022 ^[13]	India	PENG (45) FICB (45)	USG-guided PENG, 20 ml	USG-guided suprainguinal FICB, 30 ml	0.25% bupivacaine/0.25% bupivacaine	Spinal anaesthesia after block 2 mL of 0.5% bupivacaine hydrochloride heavy	IT/arthroplasty/ CRIF	Not specified	Evaluation of efficacy of postoperative analgesia 30 min post-PENG versus FICB in terms of static and dynamic VAS score

Contd...

Indian Journal of Anaesthesia | Volume 67 | Issue 11 | November 2023

Evaluation of efficacy of postoperative Evaluation of efficacy of postoperative analgesia in PENG versus FICB in analgesia in PENG versus FICB in terms of static and exercise VAS terms of dynamic NRS score USG—ultrasonography, PENG—pericapsular nerve group block, FICB—fascia iliaca compartment block, DHS—dynamic hip screw, THA—total hip arthroplasty, PFNA—proximal femoral nail antirotation, NRS—numeric rating scale, VAS—visual analogue scale, CRIF - closed reduction and internal fixation Primary outcome score Postoperative Intravenous morphine Intravenous fentanyl analgesia Types of surgery PFNA THA anaesthesia after anaesthesia after anaesthesia Table 1: Continued Local anaesthetic given Mode of General General block block bupivacaine with 1 µg/kg 1 µg/kg clonidine/0.25% bupivacaine with ropivacaine/0.375% for PENG/FICB ropivacaine clonidine 0.375% 0.25% suprainguinal suprainguinal USG-guided USG-guided FICB, 30 ml FICB, 30 ml (Technique, volume) **Block performed** FICB USG-guided I PENG, USG-guided PENG, 30 ml PENG 30 ml PENG (25) FICB (25) PENG (30) FICB (30) number) Group Reference Country India India 2023^[12] Kong 2022^[11] Vamshi

bias (such as incomplete outcome data), reporting bias (such as selective reporting) and other biases.

Data extraction

Using a pre-defined proforma, data were extracted individually by the two authors (JP and AKY), and disagreements, if any, were resolved by consultation the third author (AK). Bibliographical with information (author, year and country), the technique of block performed, local anaesthetic with or without adjuvants, mode of anaesthesia, types of surgeries, types of postoperative analgesia, description of intervention and comparator and number of participants and pain-related outcomes (NRS or VAS score and opioid requirement at 24 h and the time to first rescue analgesia) were among the data extracted. Values for several events, mean with standard deviation (SD), standard error and 95% confidence interval (CI) for different parameters were extracted from texts, tables and images from the studies that met inclusion criteria. We contacted the corresponding author of a few articles^[6–9] to get the information required. If necessary, the mean with SD was estimated using the recommended formula using the given median and interquartile range (IQR).^[18] Values for opioids were converted to an equianalgesic oral morphine dosage (mg) by established practice.^[19] As indicated previously, WebPlotDigitizer was used to extract data from graphical representations.^[20,21]

Evidence for outcomes' quality

We assessed the certainty of evidence using the Grades of Recommendation, Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach in duplicate (BR and JP), which considered study design, indirectness, imprecision, inconsistency and publication bias, among other things, and discrepancies were resolved through discussion. According to GRADE, pooled data from RCTs start as high certainty and may be rated down to moderate, low or very low if issues are identified.^[22]

Statistical analysis

For conducting a meta-analysis, we used RevMan version 5.3.5 (Copenhagen, The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014). To pool the data for continuous outcomes with various units, standardised mean difference (SMD) with 95% CI was employed, and for the same units, mean difference (MD) was used. If there was low heterogeneity, it was assumed that the true effects of the intervention were the same in all included trials, and a fixed-effect model was chosen to reflect the best estimate of the intervention effect. However, in high heterogeneity, we have chosen a random-effects model. Because the effect size for the outcomes is clinically relevant, we estimated the SMD for continuous variables using a random-effect model. The random-effects model was adopted in the analysis due to the intrinsic heterogeneity of block performance by different practitioners. We used a random-effect model and the DerSimonian and Laird approach to account for potential trial variation. Statistical heterogeneity (inconsistency) was assessed using four parameters: I-statistic, Chi-squared test, visual inspection of point estimates and visual inspection of CI overlap. To explore heterogeneity between studies, the I² measure was used. We used Begg's test and Egger's test for publishing bias. We conducted a sensitivity analysis to assess the stability of pooled data by eliminating one trial at a time. Subgroup analysis was conducted based on the types of surgeries and types of FICB to explore the possible sources of heterogeneity if there was significant heterogeneity.

RESULTS

Selection of study

Following the search, we initially identified 2960 studies; no additional records were found through other sources. We reviewed 984 full texts and included 12 RCTs^[5-15,23] in the analysis [Figure 1]. These RCTs included 644 participants, 326 who underwent PENG block and 318 who received FICB.

Characteristics of included studies

During total hip arthroplasty (THA) or hip surgery, PENG block and FICB were administered under ultrasound guidance. Levobupivacaine 0.5% and epinephrine 5 µg/ml were administered in one trial for PENG block.



Figure 1: Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) flow diagram. PENG- pericapsular nerve group block, FICB- fascia iliaca compartment block, n-number of articles, vs-versus

However, 0.25% levobupivacaine and epinephrine 5 µg/ml were used for FICB.^[15] One study used ropivacaine 0.2% with epinephrine 1:200,000 (5 µg/ml) for both blocks.^[14] Two studies used ropivacaine 0.5% for both blocks^[6,8]; however, one study used ropivacaine 0.4% for both blocks,^[5] and one study used ropivacaine 0.25% for both blocks.^[10] Three studies used bupivacaine 0.25% for both blocks^[7,13,23]; however, one study used levobupivacaine 0.25% with dexamethasone 4 mg as an adjuvant for both blocks,^[9] one study used 0.25% bupivacaine with 1 μ g/kg clonidine^[12] and another study used 0.375% ropivacaine.^[11] The patients who were a part of the studies had ages ranging from 50 years to 74 years on average. All of the reviewed studies evaluated postoperative pain throughout a range of times. In five studies, pain was assessed using VAS,^[5,6,10,11,13] whereas the other seven used the NRS.^[7-9,12,14,15,23] The characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1.

Risk-of-bias assessment

The article by Natrajan *et al.*^[8] was observed to have low quality due to improper random sequence generation and ambiguous selective reporting. The risk of bias using Cochrane's Risk-of-Bias tool is summarised in Figure 2. One study^[23] revealed a high risk of bias in outcome assessment blinding (detection bias). In comparison, one study^[8] showed a high risk of bias in random sequence generation (selection bias) and selective reporting (reporting bias). These two studies with a high risk of bias are highlighted in red. Indicators of low risk of bias are highlighted in green, while those of unclear risk of bias are highlighted in yellow. Despite a few flaws, such as allocation concealment and other types of bias, most of the studies included had high quality overall.

Quality of evidence for outcomes

To evaluate outcomes, we used the GRADE method. Pain scores at rest and during movement within 30 min and 24 h and cumulative postoperative oral morphine equivalent intake in 24 h demonstrated moderate quality of evidence. It was observed that pain scores at 6 h, at rest, during during movement at 12 h and the time to first rescue analgesia were evidence of low quality. Pain scores during movement at 6 h revealed very low quality [Supplementary Table 2].

Evidence is rated by the GRADE Working Group^[24]:

A very low—true effect is likely to differ substantially from the estimated effect (uncertain effect).

The low—true effect might be markedly different from the estimated effect (may).

The moderate—true effect is probably close to the estimated effect (probable).

The high—it is highly certain that the true effect is close to the effect estimate.

Outcomes

Postoperative pain scores at rest and during movement at 24 h were reported in eight studies^[5-9,11,14,15] and, six studies^[5,7,11,12,14,15] respectively [Figure 2]. It was documented at rest within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h by seven studies,^[5-7,10,11,13,23] eight studies^[5-9,11,14,15] and six studies,^[5-8,10,15] respectively, and during movement at within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h by nine studies,^[5-8,10-13,23] six studies^[5,7,11,12,14,15] and four studies,^[5,7,12,15] respectively [Table 2].

Primary outcome

Pain scores at rest and during movement at 24 h

There was probably no difference between the pain score in PENG block and FICB at rest (SMD: 0.17; 95% CI: -0.90 to 1.23; P = 0.76, moderate certainty) [Figure 3] and during movement at 24 h (SMD: -0.58, 95% CI: -1.53 to 0.38; P = 0.24, moderate certainty) [Figure 4].

Secondary outcomes

Pain scores at rest and during movement within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h

PENG block probably reduces pain scores relative to the FICB at rest within 30 min (SMD: -1.51; 95% CI: -2.28 to -0.73; P = 0.0001, moderate certainty). However, it remains unclear whether PENG block reduces pain scores at rest at 6 h (SMD: -0.61, 95% CI: -1.30 to 0.08, P = 0.08, low certainty) and at 12 h (SMD: -0.28, 95% CI: -0.66 to 0.09, P = 0.14, low certainty) [Supplementary Figure 1].

PENG block probably reduces pain scores relative to the FICB during movement within 30 min (SMD: -0.84; 95% CI: -1.58 to -0.10; P = 0.03, moderate certainty); however, it remains unclear during movement at 12 h (SMD: -0.36, 95% CI: -0.69 to -0.03, P = 0.03, low certainty, limited by imprecision and inconsistency). There was also no evidence for a difference in the pain score during movement at 6 h (SMD: -0.88, 95% CI: -1.77 to 0.01, P = 0.05, very low certainty) between the two treatment arms [Supplementary Figure 2].

Time to first rescue analgesia

Four studies $^{[6-8,10]}$ looked at 202 patients and reported the first rescue analgesia time (h). In the pooled



Prakash, et al.: Analgesic effect of PENG vs. FICB for hip surgeries

Figure 2: Risk of bias

Table 2: Meta	-analysis	of the c	outcomes			
Outcomes	Trials	Pa	tients, number	SMD (95% CI)	<i>I</i> ² (%)	Р
	(number)	PENG	FICB [S.ing./I.ing]			
Pain scores at rest within 30 min ^[5-7,10,11,13,23]	7	217	209 [163/46]	-1.51 (-2.28 to -0.73)	92	0.0001
Pain scores during movement within 30 min ^[5-8,10-13,23]	9	259	251 [193/58]	-0.84 (-1.58 to -0.10)	93	0.03
Pain scores at rest at 6 postoperative hours ^[5-9,11,14,15]	8	191	183 [105/78]	-0.61 (-1.30 to 0.08)	90	0.08
Pain scores during movement at 6 postoperative hours ^[5,7,11,12,14,15]	6	159	159 [135/24]	-0.88 (-1.77 to 0.01)	93	0.05
Pain scores at rest at 12 postoperative hours ^[5-8,10,15]	6	149	141 [83/58]	-0.28 (-0.66 to 0.09)	59	0.14
Pain scores during movement at 12 postoperative hours ^[5,7,12,15]	4	113	113 [83/30]	-0.36 (-0.69 to -0.03)	10	0.03
Pain scores at rest at 24 postoperative hours ^[5,7-11,14,15]	8	191	191 [135/56]	0.17 (-0.90 to 1.23)	95	0.76
Pain scores during movement at 24 postoperative hours ^[5,7,11,12,14,15]	6	159	159 [135/24]	-0.58 (-1.53 to 0.38)	94	0.24
Time to first rescue analgesia ^[6-8,10]	4	105	97 [63/34]	1.07 (-0.07 to 2.21)	92	0.07
Postoperative morphine equivalent consumption within 24 hours ^[5,6,9-12,14,15]	8	206	198 [132/66]	-5.83 (-9.63 to -2.03)	88	0.003

PENG—pericapsular nerve group block, FICB—fascia iliaca compartment block, S.ing.—suprainguinal, I.ing.—infrainguinal, CI—confidence interval,

 l^2 —heterogeneity, SMD—standardised mean difference



Figure 3: Forest plot for pain score at rest at 24 h

	F	PENG			FICB			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	IV, Random, 95% Cl
11.1.1 Suprainguinal	FICB								
Aliste 2021	2	5.92	20	2	3.7	20	16.6%	0.00 [-0.62, 0.62]	+
Choi 2022	5	0.3	27	6	0.5	27	16.2%	-2.39 [-3.10, -1.68]	-
Jadon 2021	3	1.11	33	2	0.74	33	16.9%	1.05 [0.53, 1.56]	+
Kong 2022	3	1.85	25	5	2.22	25	16.7%	-0.96 [-1.55, -0.38]	+
Vamshi 2023	2	1.48	30	4	1.48	30	16.8%	-1.33 [-1.90, -0.77]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			135			135	83.2%	-0.72 [-1.87, 0.43]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.62; C	hi² = 7	4.94, d	f=4 (P	< 0.00	001); I²	= 95%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.22	? (P = ().22)						
11.1.2 Infrainguinal F	ICB								
Hua2022	1.8	0.8	24	1.7	1	24	16.8%	0.11 [-0.46, 0.67]	+
Subtotal (95% CI)			24			24	16.8%	0.11 [-0.46, 0.67]	•
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable								
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.38	(P=0	0.71)						
Total (95% CI)			159			159	100.0%	-0.58 [-1.53, 0.38]	•
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.33; C	hi² = 7	9.12, d	f=5(P	< 0.00	001); I ²	= 94%		
Test for overall effect:	Z=1.18	(P=0	0.24)						-10 -5 U 5 10
Test for subgroup diff	erences	: Chi ²	= 1.60,	df = 1 (F	P = 0.2	1), I² =	37.4%		

Figure 4: Forest plot for the pain score during movement at 24 h

analysis, benefit remains unclear for time to first analgesic request for patients given PENG as compared to FICB (MD: 1.07; 95% CI: -0.07 to 2.21; P = 0.07, low certainty) [Supplementary Figure 3].

Postoperative opioid consumption in 24 hours

Eight studies documented opioid usage 24 h postoperatively.^[5,6,9-12,14,15] The mean cumulative opioid consumption in oral morphine equivalents (milligram) was probably less with PENG as compared to FICB in 24 h (MD: -5.83; 95% CI: -9.63 to -2.03; P = 0.003, moderate certainty) [Supplementary Figure 4].

Subgroup analysis

Our subgroup analysis is based on different types of FICB comparators (infrainguinal vs suprainguinal). We found no difference between PENG block and FICB at 24 h, both at rest and during movement in infrainguinal vs suprainguinal FICB. However, PENG block was better at reducing pain at rest within 30 min (SMD: -1.38, 95% CI: -2.28 to -0.48, P = 0.003) in suprainguinal FICB and no difference

was noted in infrainguinal FICB. A similar effect was also observed with the pain score during movement within 30 min (SMD: -1.09, 95% CI: -1.98 to -0.21, P = 0.02) [Figures 3, 4, Supplementary Figures 1 and 2].

Subgroup analysis based on different types of surgeries showed that there was no difference in pain scores between PENG block and FICB at rest at 24 h; however, pain score was less with PENG block in proximal femoral nail antirotation (PFNA) (SMD: -0.84, 95% CI: -1.42 to -0.26, one study). It was observed that pain scores at rest within 30 min were less with PENG block in positioning (SMD: -1.12, 95% CI: -2.11 to -0.13, P = 0.03, three studies); however, pain scores within 30 min on movement were less with PENG block in total hip arthroplasty (THA) (SMD: -1.24, 95% CI: -2.39 to -0.08, P = 0.04, two studies) and positioning (SMD: -1.30, 95% CI: -2.29 to -0.31, P = 0.01, three studies) [Supplementary Figures 5 and 6].

The time for the first rescue analgesic request was longer in PENG than in infrainguinal FICB and dynamic hip screw (DHS) (MD: 3.04; 95% CI: 1.02 to 5.07; two studies) [Supplementary Figures 3 and 7]. The postoperative cumulative oral morphine equivalent consumption(milligram) in 24 h was less in infrainguinal FICB (MD: -9.72; 95% CI: -18.39 to -1.05; three studies), DHS (MD: -14.04; 95% CI: -23.31 to -4.76; two studies) and THA (MD: -4.34, 95% CI: -7.03 to -1.66, three studies) [Supplementary Figures 4 and 8].

Publication bias and sensitivity analysis

Begg's test and Egger's test showed that the P value regarding pain scores at rest and on movement within 30 min, 6 h, 12 h and 24 h was more than 0.05 [Supplementary Table 3], which demonstrated that no publication bias existed in the outcome of pain scores.

The sensitivity analyses, excluding one study at a time, for pain scores at rest and during movement at various time intervals, time to first rescue analgesia and postoperative oral morphine equivalent intake in 24 h, were subjected to sequential analyses to evaluate the stability of the results. For the pain score outcome at 24 h, the sensitivity analysis did not observe any significant effect of any individual study. The rest of the sensitivity analysis is shown in Supplementary Table 4. The pain score before the nerve block at rest (baseline) is shown in Supplementary Table 5 to compare the pain score after the PENG block and FICB.

DISCUSSION

In accordance with the pooled data, there was no difference between the PENG block and the FICB at 24 h, both at rest and during movement. The pooled result suggests that PENG block and FICB have similar analgesic efficacy at 24 h, which is clinically important among the time points in the included studies. However, PENG block showed improved analgesia within 30 min at rest and during movement and reduced postoperative opioid consumption in 24 h with moderate certainty of evidence. A PENG block within 30 min will have a greater analgesic impact, which may help position the patient, particularly if given before spinal anaesthesia when the patient needs to be in a sitting or lateral decubitus position.

Regional anaesthesia is employed more frequently to deliver persistent analgesia in early postoperative period due to the developing applications of rapid recovery and the awareness of opioid-associated perioperative side effects. However, the "gold standard" regional anaesthesia for hip surgery is not yet agreed upon. The effectiveness of these two regional modalities was compared in the current meta-analysis to determine which approach is associated with superior analgesia.

The pain score during movement at 12 h was low in the PENG block. However, certainty was limited by imprecision and inconsistency. The time to first rescue analgesia and postoperative pain score both at rest and during movement at time intervals of 6 h and at rest at 12 h were similar across both regional modalities. The overall certainty of evidence in our analysis was low to moderate.

The high heterogeneity of the pooled analysis limits how reliable the result is; hence, we did a subgroup analysis. In the subgroup analysis, we did not observe differences between PENG block and suprainguinal or infrainguinal FICB at 24 h. However, the PENG block was more effective when compared with suprainguinal FICB at rest and during movement within 30 min. It seems that suprainguinal FICB is a better alternative for positioning the patient than infrainguinal FICB. However, the effect is more pronounced when compared to one vs. another group. Subgroup analysis based on the types of surgeries showed that pain scores at rest and during movement may be lower with PENG with positioning within 30 min. A similar effect was observed with THA within 30 min and at 12 h on movement, but the certainty was limited by imprecision and inconsistency.

Numerous studies assessed pain scores at 12 h and 24 h after surgery, but, by then, the acute postoperative pain peak associated with hip arthroplasty had already subsided.^[25] It was observed that many studies pay little attention to the important first few hours of severe discomfort. Instead, random late time points are picked to evaluate the patient. In the future, it might be helpful to include time points between 0 and 8 h postoperatively in analgesic studies related to elective THA to ensure that early postoperative severe pain is considered. Severe acute pain after elective THA is time-limited.^[25]

On sensitivity analysis, we did not observe any significant effect of any individual study on pain scores resulting at 24 h and postoperative oral morphine equivalent consumption. The current study's findings were also strengthened by the lack of publication bias observed in Begg's and Egger's tests. However, the quality of evidence was moderate for reducing pain using PENG block compared with FICB at 24 h at rest and during movement.

Questions about characterising the anatomical basis of the PENG block are important. Histologically, the posterior capsule lacks sensory fibres and mostly comprises mechanoreceptors, while the anterior capsule primarily contains nociceptive fibres.^[26] According to an anatomical study, the area of the joint with the greatest density of innervation is the anterior hip capsule.^[26] High branches of the FN and ON innervate the anterior hip capsule, which suggests that these nerves are the main targets for hip analgesia. PENG is an interfascial plane block that prevents the FN, ON and AON from supplying articular branches.^[27] PENG covers more hip joint articular nerves than FICB, so the block offers superior analgesia.

In a recently published meta-analysis,^[28] only six studies were included; however, three RCTs^[7,10,23] were excluded, and subgroup analysis in different surgeries was not conducted. MD was used for the pooled analysis of pain scores; however, in the included studies, both VAS and NRS were given. In another recently published meta-analysis,^[29] subgroup analysis was not conducted, and one observational study^[30] was included in the data analysis, although this was excluded in PRISMA. However, in the current meta-analysis, we used SMD for pain scores for pooled analysis (pain scores as 10-point scale VAS or NRS), and for time to first rescue analgesic request and oral morphine equivalent (mg), MD was used.

The findings of the current meta-analysis are limited by an impression that limits the certainty of evidence and could be improved by including more studies. The effect size for better analgesic effects might be moderate, and to detect those effects, well-conducted RCTs are required. The inconsistency between the studies was also high in most outcomes, suggesting variation in the study population characteristics and settings. The various factors such as differences in population characteristics and interventions might cause the high heterogeneity obtained in the present study.

As compared to conventional intravenous opioids, a peripheral nerve block is a preferred approach in the enhanced recovery after surgery protocol because it can minimise pain, hasten mobilisation and use of opioids and their associated side effects in early postoperative period.^[31]

Limitations of the current study include a small sample size of the individual RCTs included in the study. There were only 644 participants in total across twelve RCTs. Second, adjuvants were used with local anaesthetic in some of the trials. Third, in a few trials, the volume, types and adjuvants of local anaesthetic varied. The number of studies was not adequate to account for subgroup analysis. Although there was a significant difference soon after surgery, we do not believe that it had an effect on our pain-related outcomes because the higher volume would be expected to increase the time till the first analgesic request. Fourth, several studies lacked clear information on the possibility of bias from selection and other causes. Fifth, we did not do subgroup analysis based on risk of bias because only a few items were classified as high risk of bias.

CONCLUSION

We observed no difference between the PENG block and the FICB at 24 h of rest and movement with a moderate degree of certainty. However, PENG block showed improved analgesia within 30 min at rest and during movement, and reduce postoperative opioid consumption in 24 h with moderate certainty of evidence. Further large-scale and high-quality RCTs emphasising particular types of surgical interventions and uniform comparative groups are required to supplement the present findings to reach the most effective conclusion.

Financial support and sponsorship Nil.

Conflicts of interest

There are no conflicts of interest.

REFERENCES

- Perkins FM, Kehlet H. Chronic pain as an outcome of surgery. A review of predictive factors. Anesthesiology. 2000;93:1123-33.
- 2. O'Reilly N, Desmet M, Kearns R. Fascia iliaca compartment block. BJA Educ 2019;19:191-7.
- 3. Wan HY, Li SY, Ji W, Yu B, Jiang N. Fascia Iliaca Compartment Block for Perioperative Pain Management of Geriatric Patients with Hip Fractures: A Systematic Review of Randomized Controlled Trials. Pain Res Manag 2020;2020:8503963.
- Girón-Arango L, Peng PWH, Chin KJ, Brull R, Perlas A. Pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block for hip fracture. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2018;43:859-63.
- 5. Hua H, Xu Y, Jiang M, Dai X. Evaluation of pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block for analgesic effect in elderly patients with femoral neck fracture undergoing hip arthroplasty. J Healthc Eng 2022;2022:7452716.
- 6. Mosaffa F, Taheri M, Manafi Rasi A, Samadpour H, Memary E, Mirkheshti A. Comparison of pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block with fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB)

Indian Journal of Anaesthesia | Volume 67 | Issue 11 | November 2023

for pain control in hip fractures: A double-blind prospective randomized controlled clinical trial. Orthop Traumatol Surg Res 2022;108:103135.

- Jadon A, Mohsin K, Sahoo RK, Chakraborty S, Sinha N, Bakshi A. Comparison of supra-inguinal fascia iliaca versus pericapsular nerve block for ease of positioning during spinal anaesthesia: A randomised double-blinded trial. Indian J Anaesth 2021;65:572-8.
- 8. Natrajan P, Bhat RR, Remadevi R, Joseph IR, Vijayalakshmi S, Paulose TD. Comparative study to evaluate the effect of ultrasound-guided pericapsular nerve group block versus fascia iliaca compartment block on the postoperative analgesic effect in patients undergoing surgeries for hip fracture under spinal anesthesia. Anesth Essays Res 2021;15:285-9.
- 9. Senthil KS, Kumar P, Ramakrishnan L. Comparison of pericapsular nerve group block versus fascia iliaca compartment block as postoperative pain management in hip fracture surgeries. Anesth Essays Res 2021;15:352-6.
- 10. Shankar K, Rangalakshmi S, Ashwin AB, Nandini U, Chandra M, Kadlimatti DV. Comparative Study of Ultrasound Guided PENG [Pericapsular Nerve Group] Block and FIB [Fascia Iliaca Block] for Positioning and Postoperative Analgesia Prior to Spinal Anaesthesia for Hip Surgeries: Prospective Randomized Comparative Clinical Study. Indian J Anesth Analg 2020;7:798-803.
- 11. Kong M, Tang Y, Tong F, Guo H, Zhang XL, Zhou L, *et al.* The analgesic efficacy of pericapsular nerve group block in patients with intertrochanteric femur fracture: A randomized controlled trial. PLoS One 2022;17:e0275793.
- Vamshi C, Sinha C, Kumar A, Kumar A, Kumar P, Kumar A, et al. Comparison of the efficacy of pericapsular nerve group block (PENG) block versus suprainguinal fascia iliaca block (SFIB) in total hip arthroplasty: A randomized control trial. Indian J Anaesth 2023;67:364-9.
- Kalashetty MB, Channappagoudar R, Alwandikar V, Naik DL, Hulakund SY, Guddad A. Comparison of Pericapsular Nerve Group Block with Fascia Iliaca Compartment Block in Adult Patients Undergoing Hip Surgeries: A Double-Blinded Randomized Control Study. Anesth Essays Res 2022;16:397-401.
- Choi YS, Park KK, Lee B, Nam WS, Kim DH. Pericapsular Nerve Group (PENG) Block versus Supra-Inguinal Fascia Iliaca Compartment Block for Total Hip Arthroplasty: A Randomized Clinical Trial. J Pers Med 2022;12:408.
- Aliste J, Layera S, Bravo D, Jara A, Muñoz G, Barrientos C, et al. Randomized comparison between pericapsular nerve group (PENG) block and suprainguinal fascia iliaca block for total hip arthroplasty. Reg Anesth Pain Med 2021;46:874-8.
- 16. Hutton B, Salanti G, Caldwell DM, Chaimani A, Schmid CH, Cameron C, *et al.* The PRISMA extension statement for reporting of systematic reviews incorporating network meta-analyses of health care interventions: checklist and explanations. Ann Intern Med 2015;162:777-84.
- 17. Higgins JPT, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in a randomized trial. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al., editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Cochrane 2023. Available from www.training.cochrane.

org/handbook. (Last accessed on 2023 Oct 20).

- Higgins JPT, Savović J, Page MJ, Elbers RG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 6: Choosing effect measures and computing estimates of effect. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, et al., editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Cochrane 2023. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/ handbook. [Last accessed on 2023 Oct 20].
- Nielsen S, Degenhardt L, Hoban B, Gisev N. Comparing opioids: a guide to estimating oral morphine equivalents (OME) in research. in: technical report. Sydney: National Drug and Alcohol Research Centre, University of NSW, 2014.
- Roberts CA, Jones A, Montgomery C. Meta-Analysis of molecular imaging of serotonin transporters in ecstasy/ polydrug users. Neurosci Biobehav Rev 2016;63:158-67.
- 21. Morton RW, Murphy KT, McKellar SR, Schoenfeld BJ, Henselmans M, Helms E, *et al.* A systematic review, metaanalysis and meta-regression of the effect of protein supplementation on resistance training induced gains in muscle mass and strength in healthy adults. Br J Sports Med 2018;52:376-84.
- 22. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schunemann HJ, Oxman AD, Kunz R, Brozek J, *et al.* GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of evidence. J Clin Epidemiol 2011;64:401–6.
- 23. Kulkarni P, Ghodki P, Prabhu A. Pericapsular nerve group block (PENG) and fascia iliaca compartment block (FICB) for positioning patients with hip fractures for spinal anaesthesia: A comparative study between the two blocks. Arch Anesth Crit Care 2022;8:123-8.
- 24. Santesso N, Glenton C, Dahm P, Garner P, Akl EA, Alper B, *et al.* GRADE guidelines 26: informative statements to communicate the findings of systematic reviews of interventions. J Clin Epidemiol 2020;119:126-35.
- 25. Panzenbeck P, von Keudell A, Joshi GP, Xu CX, Vlassakov K, Schreiber KL, *et al.* Procedure-specific acute pain trajectory after elective total hip arthroplasty: systematic review and data synthesis. Br J Anaesth 2021;127:110-32.
- Bugada D, BelliniV, Lorini LF, Mariano ER. Update on selective regional analgesia for hip surgery patients. Anesthesiol Clin 2018;36:403-15.
- 27. Gerhardt M, Johnson K, Atkinson R, Snow B, Shaw C, Brown A, *et al.* Characterisation and classification of the neural anatomy in the human hip joint. Hip Int 2012;22:75–81.
- Ying H, Chen L, Yin D, Ye Y, Chen J. Efficacy of pericapsular nerve group block vs. fascia iliaca compartment block for Hip surgeries: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Front Surg 2023;10:1054403.
- 29. Amin SR, Ahmed F. Comparison between pericapsular nerve group block and fascia iliaca compartment block for perioperative pain control in hip surgeries: A meta-analysis from randomized controlled trials. Egyptian J Anaesth 2023;39:185-96.
- 30. Krishnamurty P, Girish MN, Dileep PK. Ultrasound guided fascia iliaca block versus pericapsular nerve group for postoperative analgesia prior to spinal anaesthesia for hip surgeries. Int J Health Sci (Qassim) 2022;6:5084-92.
- Moningi S, Patki A, Padhy N, Ramachandran G. Enhanced recovery after surgery: An anesthesiologist's perspective. J Anaesthesiol Clin Pharmacol 2019;35(Suppl 1):S5-S13.

SUPPLEMENTAL DIGITAL CONTENT [FOR ONLINE]

Name of digital content	Title of digital content	Page number
Supplementary Table 1	Search strategy	1
Supplementary Table 2	GRADE each outcome's overall evaluation of the quality of the evidence	2
Supplementary Table 3	Begg's test and Egger's test for outcomes	2
Supplementary Table 4	Sensitivity analysis performed by removing one trial at a time	3-4
Supplementary Table 5	Pain score before nerve block at rest (baseline)	4
Supplementary Figure 1	Forest plot for pain scores at rest within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h	5
Supplementary Figure 2	Forest plot for the pain score during movement within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h	6
Supplementary Figure 3	Forest plot for time to first rescue analgesia	7
Supplementary Figure 4	Forest plot for postoperative oral morphine equivalent consumption in 24 h	7
Supplementary Figure 5	Forest plot for pain score at rest within 30 min, at 6 h, 12 h and 24 h in different types of surgeries	8
Supplementary Figure 6	Forest plot for the pain score during movement within 30 min, at 6 h, 12 h and 24 h in different types of surgeries	9
Supplementary Figure 7	Forest plot for time to first rescue analgesia in different types of surgeries	10
Supplementary Figure 8	Forest plot for oral morphine equivalent consumption 24 h postoperatively in different types of surgeries	10

Supplementary Table 1: Search strategy

(((((PENG) OR (FICB)) OR (Pericapsular Nerve Block)) OR (supra-inguinal fascia iliaca)) OR (pericapsular nerve block)) OR (pericapsular nerve group block)) OR (fascia iliaca compartment block)) AND (((Hip arthroplasty OR hip fracture OR spinal OR hip surgeries OR Femur fracture OR Analgesia OR Hip fractures OR Local anaesthetics)))

("PENG"[All Fields] OR "FICB"[All Fields] OR ("Pericapsular"[All Fields] AND ("nerve block"[MeSH Terms] OR ("nerve"[All Fields] AND "block"[All Fields]) OR "nerve block"[All Fields])) OR ("supra-inguinal"[All Fields] AND ("fascia"[MeSH Terms] OR "fascia"[All Fields] OR "fasciae"[All Fields] OR "fascias"[All Fields]) AND "iliaca"[All Fields]) OR ("Pericapsular"[All Fields] AND ("nerve block"[MeSH Terms] OR ("nerve" [All Fields] AND "block" [All Fields]) OR "nerve block" [All Fields])) OR ("Pericapsular" [All Fields] AND ("nerve" [All Fields] OR "nerve s"[All Fields] OR "nerved"[All Fields] OR "nerves"[All Fields]) AND ("group s"[All Fields] OR "grouped"[All Fields] OR "grouping"[All Fields] OR "groupings" [All Fields] OR "groups s" [All Fields] OR "population groups" [MeSH Terms] OR ("population" [All Fields] AND "groups"[All Fields]) OR "population groups"[All Fields] OR "group"[All Fields] OR "social group"[MeSH Terms] OR ("social"[All Fields] AND "group"[All Fields]) OR "social group"[All Fields] OR "groups"[All Fields]) AND ("block"[All Fields] OR "blocked"[All Fields] OR "blocking"[All Fields] OR "blockings"[All Fields] OR "blocks"[All Fields])) OR (("fascia"[MeSH Terms] OR "fascia"[All Fields] OR "fasciae"[All Fields] OR "fascias" [All Fields]) AND "iliaca" [All Fields] AND ("compartment" [All Fields] OR "compartment s" [All Fields] OR "compartments" [All Fields]) AND ("block"[All Fields] OR "blocked"[All Fields] OR "blocking"[All Fields] OR "blocking"[All Fields] OR "blocking"[All Fields]])) AND (((("hip"[MeSH Terms] OR "hip"[All Fields]) AND ("arthroplasty"[MeSH Terms] OR "arthroplasty"[All Fields] OR "arthroplasties"[All Fields])) OR ("hip fractures"[MeSH Terms] OR ("hip"[All Fields] AND "fractures"[All Fields]) OR "hip fractures"[All Fields] OR ("hip"[All Fields] AND "fracture"[All Fields]) OR "hip fracture"[All Fields]) OR ("spinal"[All Fields] OR "spinalization"[All Fields] OR "spinalized"[All Fields] OR "spinalized"][All Fields] OR "spinalized"][All Fields]] OR (("hip"[MeSH Terms] OR "hip"[All Fields]) AND ("surgery"][MeSH Subheading]] OR "surgery"[All Fields] OR "surgical procedures, operative"[MeSH Terms] OR ("surgical"[All Fields] AND "procedures"[All Fields] AND "operative"[All Fields]) OR "operative surgical procedures"[All Fields] OR "general surgery"[MeSH Terms] OR ("general"[All Fields] AND "surgery" [All Fields]) OR "general surgery" [All Fields] OR "surgery s" [All Fields] OR "surgerys" [All Fields] OR "surgeries" [All Fields])) OR ("femoral fractures" [MeSH Terms] OR ("femoral" [All Fields] AND "fractures" [All Fields]) OR "femoral fractures" [All Fields] OR ("femur" [All Fields] AND "fracture" [All Fields]) OR "femur fracture" [All Fields]) OR ("analgesia" [MeSH Terms] OR "analgesia" [All Fields] OR "analgesias" [All Fields]) OR ("hip fractures" [MeSH Terms] OR ("hip" [All Fields] AND "fractures" [All Fields]) OR "hip fractures" [All Fields]) OR ("local anaesthetics" [All Fields] OR "anesthetics local" [Pharmacological Action] OR "anesthetics local" [Supplementary Concept] OR "anesthetics local" [All Fields] OR "local anesthetics" [All Fields] OR "anesthetics, local" [MeSH Terms] OR ("anesthetics" [All Fields] AND "local"[All Fields]) OR ("local"[All Fields] AND "anesthetics"[All Fields])))

Suppler	nentary Table	2: GRADE o	verall assessm	ent of the q	uality of evid	dence for each r	esult
Outcome	Study design	Risk of bias	Inconsistency	Indirectness	Imprecision	Publication bias	Quality of evidence
Pain scores at rest within 30 min	Randomised trials	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ Moderate
Pain scores at rest at 6 h	Randomised trials	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low
Pain scores at rest at 12 h	Randomised trials	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low
Pain scores at rest at 24 h	Randomised trials	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ Moderate
Pain scores during movement within 30 min	Randomised trials	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ Moderate
Pain scores during movement at 6 h	Randomised trials	Serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊖⊖⊖ Very low
Pain scores during movement at 12 h	Randomised trials	Not serious	serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low
Pain scores during movement at 24 h	Randomised trials	Not serious	Serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ Moderate
Time to first rescue analgesia	Randomised trials	Serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Low
24 h postoperative morphine equivalent consumption	Randomised trials	Not serious	Not serious	Not serious	Serious	Undetected	⊕⊕⊕⊖ Moderate

		Supplemen	tary Table 3:	Begg's t	test and Egg	er's test for outco	omes		
Time	Subgroup	C	n rest		Eggers P	On n	novement		Egger's P
		No. of studies	Begg's Z	Р		No. of studies	Begg's Z	Р	
<30 min	Infra	3	-0.52	0.6	0.617	4	0.01	0.99	0.63
	Supra	4	-0.68	0.5	0.14	5	-0.98	0.33	0.38
6h	Infra	4	0.1	0.9	0.8	1	-	-	-
	Supra	4	-1.36	0.174	0.08	5	-1.96	0.05	0.07
12h	Infra	3	0.52	0.6	0.9	2	1	0.3	-
	Supra	3	1.57	0.1	0.49	2	-	-	-
24h	Infra	4	0.01	0.99	0.8	2	-1.0	0.3	-
	Supra	4	-1.36	0.2	0.16	3	-1.57	0.1	0.17

No: number

Supple	mentary Table 4: \$	Sensitivity ana	lysis performed by removir	ng one trial	at a time
Outcomes	Excluded study	Z	P-value for difference	ľ ²	P-value for heterogeneity
Pain scores at rest	Mosaffa et al.	3.63	0.0003	93	<0.00001
within 30 min	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	3.46	0.0005	93	<0.00001
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	3.27	0.001	91	<0.00001
	Kulkarni <i>et al</i> .	3.99	<0.0001	91	<0.00001
	Shankar <i>et al</i> .	3.21	0.001	92	<0.00001
	Kalashetty <i>et al</i> .	3.50	0.0005	89	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	3.58	0.0003	93	<0.00001
Pain scores during	Mosaffa <i>et al</i> .	2.37	0.02	93	<0.00001
movement within 30 min	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	1.82	0.07	94	<0.00001
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	1.78	0.08	93	<0.00001
	Natrajan <i>et al</i> .	2.7	0.007	93	<0.00001
	Kulkarni <i>et al</i> .	2.09	0.04	94	<0.00001
	Shankar <i>et al</i> .	1.74	0.08	93	<0.00001
	Kalashetty <i>et al</i> .	1.79	0.07	91	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	2.68	0.007	92	<0.00001
	Vamshi <i>et al</i> .	1.99	0.05	94	<0.00001
Pain scores at rest at 6	Choi <i>et al</i> .	1.28	0.20	30	0.20
postoperative hours	Aliste <i>et al</i> .	1.72	0.09	91	<0.00001
	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	1.72	0.09	91	<0.00001
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	1.61	0.11	91	<0.00001
	Mosaffa <i>et al</i> .	1.75	0.08	91	<0.00001
	Natrajan <i>et al</i> .	1.68	0.09	91	<0.00001
	Senthil <i>et al</i> .	1.91	0.06	91	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	1.46	0.14	91	<0.00001
Pain scores during	Choi <i>et al</i> .	1.34	0.18	87	<0.00001
movement at	Aliste <i>et al</i> .	1.98	0.05	94	<0.00001
6 postoperative hours	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	1.95	0.05	93	<0.00001
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	2.11	0.04	93	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	1.39	0.16	92	<0.00001
	Vamshi <i>et al</i> .	1.62	0.11	94	<0.00001
Pain scores at rest at	Aliste <i>et al</i> .	1.53	0.13	64	0.003
12 postoperative hours	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	0.88	0.38	41	0.15
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	2.5	0.01	37	0.17
	Mosaffa <i>et al</i> .	0.92	0.36	60	0.04
	Natrajan <i>et al</i> .	1.42	0.16	66	0.02
	Shankar <i>et al</i> .	1.18	0.24	67	0.02
Pain scores during	Aliste et al.	2.16	0.03	22	0.26
movement at	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	2.11	0.03	10	0.33
12 postoperative hours	Hua <i>et al</i> .	1.42	0.15	48	0.17
	Vamshi <i>et al</i> .	0.92	0.36	0	0.71
Pain scores at rest at	Choi <i>et al</i> .	1.20	0.23	94	<0.00001
24 postoperative hours	Aliste <i>et al</i> .	0.30	0.76	96	<0.00001
	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	0.29	0.77	96	<0.00001
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	0.27	0.79	96	<0.00001
	Senthil <i>et al</i> .	0.05	0.96	96	<0.00001
	Natrajan <i>et al</i> .	0.38	0.70	96	<0.00001
	Shankar <i>et al</i> .	0.94	0.35	91	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	0.51	0.61	96	<0.00001
Pain scores during	Choi <i>et al</i> .	0.13	0.90	88	<0.0001
movement at 24	Aliste et al.	0.76	0.45	95	<0.00001
postoperative hours	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	1.48	0.14	94	<0.00001
	Hua <i>et al</i> .	0.79	0.43	95	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	0.43	0.67	95	<0.00001

		Supplementar	y Table 4: Continued		
Outcomes	Excluded study	Z	P-value for difference	ľ	P-value for heterogeneity
Time to first rescue	Mosaffa et al.	0.65	0.52	91	<0.0001
analgesia	Jadon <i>et al</i> .	2.90	0.004	58	0.09
	Natrajan <i>et al</i> .	0.33	0.74	89	<0.0001
	Shankar <i>et al</i> .	0.75	0.45	93	<0.00001
24 hours postoperative	Aliste et al.	3.44	0.0006	88	<0.00001
morphine equivalent	Choi <i>et al</i> .	3.20	0.001	87	<0.00001
consumption	Hua <i>et al</i> .	3.18	0.001	88	<0.00001
	Mosaffa <i>et al</i> .	2.95	0.003	85	<0.00001
	Senthil et al.	2.77	0.006	85	<0.00001
	Shankar <i>et al</i> .	3.13	0.002	82	<0.00001
	Vamshi <i>et al</i> .	2.60	0.009	88	<0.00001
	Kong <i>et al</i> .	2.56	0.01	76	0.0003

Supplementary 1	Cable 5: Pain score bef rest (baseline)	ore nerve block at
Study	PENG (mean±SD)	FICB (mean±SD)
Choi 2022 ^[14]	2.6±0.4	2.8±0.5
Mosaffa 2022 ^[6]	4.33±0.88	4.63±1.39
Kulkarni 2022 ^[23]	6.03±1.40	6.63±1.45
Shankar 2020 ^[10]	7.8±0.47	7.6±0.40
Hua 2022 ^[5]	3.8±0.84	3.84±0.88
Jadon 2021 ^[7]	6.0±0.74	5.0±1.11
Natrajan 2022 ^[8]	7.67±1.86	7.33±1.42

SD: Standard deviation, PENG: Pericapsular nerve group block, FICB: Fascia iliaca compartment block







Supplementary Figure 2: Forest plot for the pain score during movement within 30 min, at 6 h and 12 h



Supplementary Figure 3: Forest plot for time to first rescue analgesia



Supplementary Figure 4: Forest plot for postoperative oral morphine equivalent consumption in 24 h

at rest (within 50 mil	1 0000			2			0	
Study or Subgroup	Mean SD	Total	FICI Mean S	B D Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	
23.1.1 Positioning Jadon 2021	3 1.48	33	4 0.7	4 33	14.7%	-0.84 [-1.35, -0.34]	-	
Kulkarni 2021 Shankar 2020	2.9 1.09	30	3.4 1.5	2 30	14.7%	-0.37 [-0.88, 0.14]	-1	
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.0 0.4	93	2.0 1.	93	43.5%	-1.12 [-2.11, -0.13]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ⁴ = Test for overall effect:	0.69; Chi ^x = 1 Z = 2.22 (P = 1	9.37, df 0.03)	= 2 (P < 0.)	0001); 12 :	= 90%			
23.1.2 DHS								
Mosaffa 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	3.2 0.55	30 30	3.73 0.9	18 22 22	14.5% 14.5%	-0.69 [-1.25, -0.12] -0.69 [-1.25, -0.12]	•	
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	blicable	0.02)						
23.1.3 THA		,						
Hua 2022	1.3 0.4	24	2.9 0	6 24	13.2%	-3.09 [-3.94, -2.23]	T	
Heterogeneity: Not app	blicable	24		24	13.270	-5.05 [-5.54, -2.25]	•	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.05 (P <)	0.00001	1)					
23.1.4 IT/Arthroplasty kalashetty 2022	2.16 0.67	45	4.07 0.6	9 45	14.4%	-2.78 [-3.37, -2.20]	-	
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not app	licable	45		45	14.4%	-2.78 [-3.37, -2.20]	•	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 9.31 (P <	0.00001	1)					
23.1.5 PFNA								
Subtotal (95% CI)	2 1.11	25	3 1.4	25	14.4%	-0.75 [-1.33, -0.18] -0.75 [-1.33, -0.18]	•	
Heterogeneity: Not app Test for overall effect:	z = 2.56 (P = 1	0.01)						
Total (95% CI)		217		209	100.0%	-1.51 [-2.28, -0.73]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.00; Chi ² = 7	2.53, df	= 6 (P < 0.	00001); l²	= 92%		-10 -5 0 5	10
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Chi ² =	46.37.	df = 4 (P <	0.00001)	, l² = 91.49	%	Favours PENG Favours FICB	
at rest (at 6 h)				-				
Study or Subgroup	PENG Mean SD	Total	FIC Mean S	B Total	Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	
12.1.1 THA Aliste 2021	1.5 5.18	20	2 4	14 20	12.7%	-0.10 [-0.72. 0.52]	+	
Choi 2022 Hua 2022	3.4 0.3	27	5.1 0	.5 27	11.1%	-4.06 [-5.02, -3.11]	- 1	
Subtotal (95% CI)	0.0 0.3	24 71	0.0 0	71	36.6%	-1.46 [-3.50, 0.58]	-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	3.11; Chi ² = 5 Z = 1.40 (P =	2.02, df 0.16)	r = 2 (P < 0.	00001); F	* = 96%			
12.1.2 DHS								
Mosaffa 2021 Natrajan 2021	3.46 1.27 2.75 1.46	30 12	3.45 1.4	47 22 78 12	12.9%	0.01 [-0.54, 0.56]	#	
Senthil 2021 Subtotal (95% CI)	1.85 0.99	20	1.55 1.0	05 20	12.6%	0.29 [-0.34, 0.91]	-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Chi ² = 1	.29, df	= 2 (P = 0.5	2); l ² = 0	%		ľ	
lest for overall effect:	Z = 0.22 (P =	0.82)						
12.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021	1 1.48	33	1.12	48 33	13.2%	0.00 [-0.48, 0.48]	+	
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not an	olicable	33		33	13.2%	0.00 [-0.48, 0.48]	•	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.00 (P =	1.00)						
12.1.4 PFNA								
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI)	2 0.74	25 25	3 1.4	48 25 25	12.8% 12.8%	-0.84 [-1.42, -0.26] -0.84 [-1.42, -0.26]	•	
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 2.84 (P =	0.004)						
Total (95% CI)		191		183	100.0%	-0.61 [-1.30, 0.08]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =							S SS 7	
Taet for mann	0.87; Chi ² = 6	8.73, di	f = 7 (P < 0)	00001); P	² = 90%		-10 -5 0 5	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe	0.87; Chi ² = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = erences: Chi ² =	8.73, di 0.08) = 8.43. (f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0	00001); F	² = 90% 64.4%		-10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at rest (at 12 h)	0.87; Chi ² = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = PENG	8.73, di 0.08) = 8.43, d	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI	00001); F 0.04), F ² = B	² = 90% 64.4%	Std. Mean Difference	-10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA	0.87; Chi* = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = PENG Mean SD	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43, d Total	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean 5	00001); F D.04), F ² = B SD Total	² = 90% 64.4% Weight	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022	0.87; Chi* = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = PENG <u>Mean SD</u> 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43, d Total 20 24	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean 5 1.5 3 0.4 0	00001); F 0.04), I ² = <u>B</u> <u>5D Total</u> 1.7 20 1.3 24	² = 90% 64.4% Weight 16.0% 17.1%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl 0.00 (-0.62, 0.62) 0.33 (-0.24, 0.90)	-10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneiber Teur ² –	0.87; Chi ² = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = PENG <u>Mean SD</u> 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chi ² = 0	8.73, dt 0.08) = 8.43. d Total 20 24 44 158 dt	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean 5 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4	00001); F 0.04), F B <u>50 Total</u> 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 5); F = 0°	² = 90% 64.4% Weight 16.0% 17.1% 33.1%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.62, 0.62] 0.33 [-0.24, 0.90] 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60]	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diffect at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity. Tau ² = Test for overall effect:	0.87; Chi ² = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chi ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P =	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43. d 20 24 44 1.58, df 0.41)	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean \$ 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4	00001); P 0.04), P 3 5 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 5); P = 09	² = 90% 64.4% Weight 16.0% 17.1% 33.1%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.62, 0.62] 0.33 [-0.24, 0.90] 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60]	-10 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N/, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for sverall effect: Test for subaroup diff at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: 15.1.2 DHS	0.87; Chi ² = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = <u>PENG Mean SD</u> 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chi ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P =	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43. d Total 20 24 44 1.58, df 0.41)	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean 5 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4	00001); P 0.04), P B <u>5D</u> Total 1.3 24 44 5); P = 09	2 = 90% 64.4% Weight 1 6.0% 17.1% 33.1%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.62, 0.62] 0.33 [-0.24, 0.90] 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60]	10 5 5 Favours PENG Favours FIC8 Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% Cl	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) -deterogeneity. Tau ² = Fest for overall effect 15.1.2 DHS Mosaffa 2021 Vatrajan 2021	0.87; Chri = 6 Z = 1.74 (P = rrences: Chi ^a = PENG <u>Mean SD</u> 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chi ^a = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43, d Total 20 24 44 1.58, df 0.41) 30 12	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = (<u>Mean \$</u> 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1.4 2.17 0.5	00001); P 0.04), P B D Total 5D Total 5D Total 44 5); P = 09 48 22 92 12	² = 90% 64.4% Weight 1 16.0% 17.1% 33.1% 5 17.2%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.33 (-0.24, 0.90) 0.18 (-0.24, 0.60) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.90, 0.70)	10 - 5 - 6 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference FICB	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff. At rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Niels 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Fest for overall effect: 15.1.2 DHS Mosaffa 2021 Vatrajan 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ²	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = rences: Chi ² = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chi ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 1 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Chi ² = 1	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43. d 20 24 44 1.58, df 0.41) 30 12 42 42 .46, df	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean 5 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1. 2.17 0. = 1 (P = 0.2	00001); P 0.04), P 3 50 Total 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 45); P = 09 48 22 92 12 34 34 32 12 34 34 35 12 34 34 35 12 34 34 35 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	² = 90% 64.4% <u>Weight</u> 16.0% 17.1% 33.1% 5 17.2% 12.3% 29.5%	Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.33 {0.24, 0.90] 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60] -0.70 [-1.27, -0.13] -0.10 {0.90, 0.70] -0.47 [-1.05, 0.11]	-10 -5 - 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Stit Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subarroup diff at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Huia 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Subtotal (95% C) Test for overall effect 15.1.2 DHS Mosaffa 2021 Natrajan 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Federogeneik, Tau ² = Test for overall effect	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = rences: ChP = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; ChP = 0 Z = 0.83 (P =) 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; ChP = 1 Z = 1.59 (P =)	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43. (Total 20 24 44 1.58, df 0.41) 30 12 42 42 .46, df 0.11)	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 <u>Mean \$</u> 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1. 2.17 0. = 1 (P = 0.2	00001); F 0.04), F 3 5D Total 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 5); F 9 48 22 32 12 34 3); F = 31	² = 90% 64.4% <u>Weight</u> 1 16.0% 1 17.1% 33.1% 5 17.2% 12.3% 29.5% %	Std. Mean Dffference V, Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.82, 0.62) 0.33 (-0.24, 0.90) 0.18 (-0.24, 0.60) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.90, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11)	-10 -5 -6 Favours PENG Favours FIC8 Skit Mean Differences IV, Random, 95% C1	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subproup diff. Study or Subproup 15.1.1 THA Highs 2021 Hug 2022 Subidal (95% C) Helerogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 15.1.2 DHS Mosaffa 2021 Natrajan 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Federogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 15.1.3 Positioning wide 2021	0.87 (chr) = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = rences: Ch ² + PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Ch ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Ch ² = 1 Z = 1.59 (P =	8.73, df 0.08) = 8.43. (Total 20 24 44 1.58, df 0.41) 30 12 42 42 .46, df 0.11)	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = (<u>Mean \$</u> 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1. 2.17 0. = 1 (P = 0.2	00001); ² = 3 50 Total 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 5); ² = 09 48 22 32 12 34 3); ² = 31	* = 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 17.1% 33.1% 5 17.2% 5 17.2% 5 29.5%	Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.316 02, 025 0.316 02, 026 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60] -0.70 [-1.27, -0.13] -0.10 [-0.30, 0.70] -0.47 [-1.05, 0.11]	-10 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Sid. Mean Differences N. Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effoct: Test for subaroup diff at rest (at 12 h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Ailste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overail effect 15.1.2 DHS Mosaffa 2021 Natrajan 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overail all ² Test for overail all ² Test for overail all ² Test for overail all ² Subtotal (95% CI)	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 1,74 (P = rences: Ch ² + PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Ch ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Ch ² = 1 Z = 1.59 (P = 2 0.74 6.14 0.55	8,73, di 0.08) = 8,43, (Total 20 24 44 458, df :58, df :0,41) 30 12 42 42 42,46, df :0,11) 33 30	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 <u>Mean \$</u> 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1. 2.17 0. = 1 (P = 0.2 3 1. 6.4 1.	00001); ² = 3 50 Total 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 45); ² = 09 48 22 34 3); ² = 31 48 33 01 30	* = 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 17.1% 33.1% 5 17.2% 29.5% 29.5% 18.8% 18.8%	Std. Mean Difference V. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.62, 0.62) 0.33 (-0.24, 0.60) 0.18 (-0.24, 0.60) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.60, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34)	10 -5 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FIC8 Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overall effoct: Test for subaroun diff at rest [412,h] Study or Subaroun [51,11] Hull Hula 2021 Studtotal (955;C1) Heterogeneik; Tau ² = Test for overall effect [51,12] DHS Mossifia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Studtotal (955;C1) Studtotal (955;C1) Studtotal (955;C1) Studtotal (955;C1) Studtotal (955;C1) Studtotal (955;C1) Heterogeneik; Tau ² = Test for overall effect [51,13] Postitioning Jadon 2021 Studtotal (955;C1)	0.87 (chr = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = rences: Ch ² + PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Ch ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Ch ² = 1 Z = 1.59 (P = 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.10; Ch ² = 2	8,73, df 0,06) = 8,43, 4 <u>Total</u> 20 24 44 4,58, df 0,41) 30 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 4	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean \$ 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1. 2.17 0. = 1 (P = 0.2 3 1. 6.4 1. = 1 (P = 0.1	00001); F 0.04), F 3 5D Total 5D Total 5D Total 5D Total 44 5); F 9 48 22 34 3); F 31 48 33 13 13 10 63 11 17 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	* = 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 17.1% 33.1% 5 17.2% 17.2% 17.2% 12.3% 29.5% %	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.02, 0.02) 0.33 (-0.24, 0.02) -0.37 (-0.24, 0.00) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.00, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.26 (-0.77, 0.25) -0.55 (-1.13, 0.02)	-10 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroun diff at rest [41.2.h] Study or Subaroun [51.11] Hulp round Hula 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Test for overall effect 15.1.2 PMS Mosaffa 2021 Natrajan 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) 15.1.3 Postlening Jadon 2021 Santotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Test for overall effect	0.87 (chr = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00 (chr ² = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06 (chr ² = 1 Z = 1.59 (P = 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.10 (chr ² = 2 Z = 1.90 (P =	8,73, df 0,068) = 8,43, e Total 20 24 44 44 4,58, df 0,41) 30 12 46, df 0,11) 33 30 63 35,54, df 0,065)	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = (<u>Mean \$</u> 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1 2.17 0.1 = 1 (P = 0.2 3 1 6.4 1.1 = 1 (P = 0.1	00001); F 0.04), F 3 5D Total 5D Total 44 5); F 90 48 22 92 12 34 34 3); F 91 48 34 301 30 30 31 1); F 92 12 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34 34	* = 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 1 7.1% 33.1% 5 1 12.3% 29.5% 1 2.3% 29.5% 1 18.8% 1 18.8% 1 8.7% 37.4%	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.62, 0.62) 0.31 (-0.24, 0.60) 0.18 (-0.24, 0.60) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.60, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (+1.35, -0.24) -0.36 (-0.77, 0.25) -0.36 (+1.3, 0.02)	-10 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Stit Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effoct: Test for suberoup diff at cest [at 2,b] Study or Study or Study or Study or Hales 2021 Hua 2022 Study of Sty Study - Test for overail effect 15.12 DHS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Study of (SS-CI) Heterogeneity. Tau'e Test for overail effect 15.13 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Shankar 2020 Shankar 2020 Shankar 2020 Study of (SS-CI) Heterogeneit, Tau'e Test for overail effect Total (SS-CI)	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Ch ² = 0 2 - 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Ch ² = 1 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.10; Ch ² = 2 2 - 1.90 (P = 0.13; Ch ² = -	8,73, db 0,06) = 8,43, c = 8,43, c 20 24 44 458, df 1,58, df 1,59, df 1,59, df 1,50,	f = 7 (P < 0.) df = 3 (P = 0.) f = 1 (P = 0.4) f = 1 (P = 0.4) f = 1 (P = 0.4) f = 1 (P = 0.2) f = 1 (P = 0.1) f = 5 (P = 0.2)	00001); r 3 5D Total 3D Total 5D; r = 09 48 222 21 22 34 33); r = 31 48 33 11 30 63 63 11; r = 61 1411	* = 90% 64.4% Weight 1 16.0% 1 7.1% 33.1% 5 1 12.3% 2 9.5% 1 2.3% 1 18.8% 1 18.8% 3 37.4% % 100.0% 100.0%	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.016 02, 023 0.33 16 24, 030 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60] -0.70 [+1.27, 0.13] -0.19 [-0.00, 0.70] -0.47 [+1.05, 0.11] -0.84 [+1.35, -0.34] -0.26 [-0.7, 0.25] -0.25 [-1.13, 0.02] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09]	-10 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Sit. Mean Difference Nr. Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effoct: Test for suberoup diff at rest [at 12,h] Study of Study of Study of Huka 2022 Study of Study of Study of Heterogeneity, Taul #et Test for overail affect 15,12 DHS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Study of Study of Heterogeneity, Taul #et Test for overail affect Test for overail offect Test for overail affect Test for overail affect Test for overail affect	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 1.74 (P = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chri = 0 2 = 0.83 (P = 1 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Chri = 1 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.10; Chri = 2 2 = 1.90 (P = 1 0.13; Chri = 1 2 = 1.49 (P = 1	8,73, df 0,06) = 8,43, c Total 20 24 44 44 45,58, df 1,58, df 1,58, df 0,41) 30 12 46, df 33 30 6,54, df 0,05) 149 2,22, df 0,149 2,22, df 0,149 2,24 4,49	f = 7 (P < 0.) df = 3 (P = 0.) f = 0.4 1.5 = 3.0.4 = 0.0 1.5 = 3.0.4 = 0.0 1.7 = 0.1.2 1.7 = 0.2.17 = 0.2.2 3 = 1.(P = 0.2.2) 3 = 1.(P = 0.2.2) 3 = 1.(P = 0.2.2) 1.7 = 0.2.2 1.7 = 0	00001); r 3 3 3 3 5 5 5 7 2 0 3 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4 4	* = 90% 64.4% • Weight • 16.0% • 17.1% • 33.1% * * • 17.2% • 12.3% • 29.5% % • 18.8% • 18.8% • 37.4% • 37.4% • 39%	Stil, Mean Difference N, Random, 95%, CI 0.010-62, 04, 030 0.310-24, 040 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60] -0.70 [-1.27, -0.13] -0.10 [-0.30, 0.70] -0.47 [-1.05, 0.11] -0.84 [-1.35, -0.34] -0.26 [-0.70, 0.25] -0.25 [-1.13, 0.02] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09]	-10 -5 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Sid. Mean Differences NV. Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effoct: Test for suberoup diff at rest [at 12,h] Study of Studyong Units Study of Studyong Units Hua 2022 Studyof Studyong Units Heterogeneik, Taul [#] =: Test for overail effoct 15,12 PMS Morafin 2021 Natrajan 2021 Studyof (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Taul [#] =: Test for overail effoct 15,13 Positioning Jadon 2021 Studyof (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Taul [#] =: Test for overail effoct Test for	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 7,74 (P = 1 PERG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chi ² = 0 2 0.83 (P = 1 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Chi ² = 1 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.10; Chi ² = 1 2 1.90 (P = 1 2 1.49 (P = 1 2 1.49 (P = 1 2 1.49 (P = 1) 2 1.49 (P = 1)	8,73, df 0,068) = 8,43, c 20 24 44 458, df 1,58, df 1,58, df 1,22 46, df 1,2 30 0,24 4,4, df 1,22 46, df 1,22 46, df 1,22 4,4, df 1,23 1,24	f = 7 (P < 0.) df = 3 (P = 0.) f = 1 (P = 0.4) 3.91 1 2.17 0 f = 1 (P = 0.2) 3 1 6.4 1 f = 1 (P = 0.1) f = 5 (P = 0.) df = 2 (P = 0.)	00001); r 3 3 5D Total 5D Total 5D; r 204 44 45 5); r 204 44 45 5); r 204 44 44 45 5); r 204 44 44 45 5); r 204 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	= 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 1 7.7% 33.1% 5 1 7.7% 8% 1 17.2%, 17.7% 8% 1 18.8% 8% 1 8.7% 5% 1 00.0% 562.9%	Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI 0.01 0.02, 0.021 0.33 0.024, 0.021 0.31 0.024, 0.020 0.18 (-0.24, 0.001 -0.70 (+1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (+0.00, 0.701 -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] Std. Mean Officiary	Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effoct: Test for suberoup diff at rest fat 12.h) Study of Study of Subgroup 15.11 TMS (Subgroup 15.11 TMS) Hua 2022 Studtota (SS-G) Heterogeneik, Tau'= Test for overail effect 15.12 DMS Marajan 2021 Marajan 2021 Studtota (SS-G) Heterogeneik, Tau'= Test for overail effect 15.13 Postioning Jadon 2021 Studtota (SS-G) Heterogeneik, Tau'= Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Test for subgroup diff at rest (ra 2A h) Study of Subgroup diff at rest (ra 2A h)	0.87; Chri = 6 2 = 1,74 (P = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Ch ² = 0 2 - 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Ch ² = 1 2 - 0.74 6.14 0.55 0.10; Ch ² = 1 2 - 1.49 (P = rences: Ch ² = rences: Ch ² = PENG Mean SD PENG PEN	8,73, d0 0,08) = 8,43, (20 24 20 24 44 44 44 458, df= 0,41) 30 61 20 24 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	f = 7 (P < 0. df = 3 (P = 0 FICI Mean \$ 1.5 3 0.4 0 = 1 (P = 0.4 3.91 1. 2.17 0.5 = 1 (P = 0.2 3 1. 6.4 1.1 = 1 (P = 0.1 1 = 5 (P = 0. df = 2 (P = 0. FICI Mean \$ 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5 1.5	00001; r; 0.04), P = 3 5D Total 5D, P = 09 48 222 34 48 33; P = 31 48 33; P = 31 141 103; P = 61 1411 03; P = 5 5D Total	= 90% 64.4% I Weight 1 16.0% 7.1% 33.1% 5 29.5% 8 37.4% 9 400.0% 62.9% 62.9% I weight	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.82, 0.82) 0.33 (-0.24, 0.80) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.00, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effoct: Test for subaroux diffi at rest [at 12, h] Study of Study or Subaroux TS.1.1 THA Alste 2021 Heiterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overail effect TS.1.2 UHS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Subdota (95% Cu) Heiterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overail effect TS.1.5 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subdota (95% Cu) Heiterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overail effect Test for subaroux di futoro Test for subaroux di futoro Study or Subaroux TS.1.1 THA Alste 2021	0.87, Chr = 6 2 = 1,74 (P = 1 PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chr = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 1 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Ch = 1 Z = 1.59 (P = 1 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.10; Chr = 1 Z = 1.49 (P = 1 0.13; Chr = 1 2 = 1.49 (P = 1)) 2 = 1.49 (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1)) 3 = 1.49 (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1)) 3 = 1.49 (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1)) 3 = 1.49 (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1)) 3 = 1.49 (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1)) 3 = 1.49 (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1) (P = 1)	8,73, df 0,08) = 8,43, (20 24 44 44 44 458, df 158, df 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 4	F = 7 (P < 0. f = 3 (P = (FICIC 1.5 3 0.4 0 1.5 3 1.5 4 1.5 4 1.5 1 1.5 1 1.5 4 1.5 1 1.5 1 1.5 1 1.5 3 1.5 1 1.5 3 1.5 1 1.5 1 1.5 1 1.5 3 1.5 1 1.5 1 1	00001); r ; 0.04), P = 3 5D Total 10 Total	= 90% 64.4% I Weight I 16.0% 7.1% 33.1% 5.23.5% 17.2% 23.5% 5.23.5% 62.9% 62.9% 62.9% 100.0% 10.0% 12.6%	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.82, 0.82) 0.33 (-0.24, 0.60) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.90, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.38 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.38 (-1.05, 0.13) -0.38 (-1.05, 0.13) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.82, 0.82)	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subarouo diff at rest (st 12 h) Study of Study cup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hula 2022 Studtat (195% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau'e Test for overall effect 15.1.2 DHS Mosafia 2021 Studtat (195% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau'e Studtat (195% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau'e Studtat (195% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau'e Studtat (195% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau'e Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Aliste 2021 Aliste 2021 Aliste 2021 Aliste 2021	0.87, Chr = 6 2 = 1,74 (P = PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00; Chr = 0 Z = 0.83 (P = 3.01 1.08 2.08 0.88 0.06; Chr = 1 Z = 1.59 (P = 1.59 (P = 2 = 1.90 (P = 0.13; Chr = 1 Z = 1.90 (P = 0.13; Chr = 1 PENG Mean SD 0 4.44 2.5 0.3 2 0.8 0 4.44 2.5 0.3 2 0.8 0 4.44 0 5 0 1.5 0 1	8,73, df 0,08) = 8,43, (20 24 44 44 458, df 158, df 158, df 12 42 42, 44, 44, 44, 44, 44, 44,	f = 7 (P < 0.	00001; r - 00001; r - 3 5D Total 1,7 20 1,7 20 1,8 4 1,9 - 1,9	= 90% 64.4% Weight 1 16.0% 1 7.1% 3 33.1% 1 17.2% 3 17.2% 5 22.5% 5 18.8% 5 18.8% 5 6 1 10.0% 5 6 2 25.5% 6 2.9% 6 2.9% 6 2.9% 1 12.6% 7 11.8% 1 22.6% 1	Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI 0.01-062, 05% CI 0.31-024, 0.60] 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60] 0.19 [-0.24, 0.60] 0.19 [-0.24, 0.60] 0.10 [-0.00, 0.70] -0.47 [-1.05, 0.11] -0.47 [-1.05, 0.14] -0.26 [-1.13, 0.02] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.62, 0.82] -2.87 [-3.64, -2.09] 0.12 [-0.44, 0.66] 0.12 [-0.44, 0.66] 0.1	10	10
Test for overall effoct: Test for subarous diff at rest [st 12, h] Study of Study coup 15, 1, 1 THA Allete 2021 Hua 2022 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Taulf Test for overall effect 15, 12, DHS Mosafia 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Taulf Test for overall effect 15, 13, DHS Mosafia 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Taulf Test for overall effect Test f	0.87, Chr = 6 2 = 1,74 (P = 7 PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.00, Ch ² = 0 2 - 0.83 (P = 1 3.01 1.06 2.08 0.88 0.08 0.88 0.06; Ch ² = 1 2 - 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.00; Ch ² = 1 2 - 1.90 (P = 1 2 - 1.90 (P = 1) 2 - 1	8.73, di 0.08) = 8.43, d 200 24 44 4.58, df 0.41) 30 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 4	f = 7 (P < 0.0 $f = 3 (P = (f = 1)^{-1} (P < 0.1)^{-1} (P = 0.$	00001; r ; r 3 50 Total 50 Total	= 90% 64.4% Weight 1 16.0% 3.17.1% 3.3.1% 1 17.2% 3.3.1% 5 17.2% 5 22.5% 1 18.8% 5 3 1 10.0% 5 3 1 18.7% 5 3 1 10.0% 5 3 5 4 1 10.0% 5 3 1 10.0% 5 3 1 10.0% 5 3 1 10.0% 5 4 1 10.0% 5 5 1 10.0% 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.2, 0.4 0.2) 0.31 (-0.2, 0.4 0.2) 0.31 (-0.2, 0.4 0.2) 0.10 (-0.00, 0.70) 0.47 (-1.05, -0.14) -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.2, 0.23) -0.59 (-1.2, 0.4) 0.00 (-0.2, 0.23) -0.59 (-1.2, 0.4) -0.59	Favours PENO Favours FICB	10
Test for overall effect: Test for subaroun diff at rest [412,h] Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Allete 2021 Hua 2022 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau?= Test for overall effect 15.1.2 PMS Mosaffa 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau?= Test for overall effect 15.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021 Stantotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau?= Test for overall effect Test for overall effect	0.8/7 Chr = 6 2 = 1,74 (P PENG Mean SD 1.5 4.44 0.5 0.3 0.000 Chr = 0 2 = 0.83 (P = 1 3.01 1.09 2.08 0.83 (P = 1 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.100 Chr = 0 2 1.59 (P = 1 2 0.74 6.14 0.95 0.13 Chr = 1 2 2 1.49 (P = 1 0.13 Chr = 1 2 2 1.49 (P = 1 2 1.	8,73, df) 0,08) = 8,43, (200 24 44 458, df) 0,41) 30 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 4	$ \begin{aligned} &= 7 \left(P \neq 0, 0 \\ &= 1 \left(P = 0, 1 \\ &= 1 \left(P = 0, 4 \\ &= 1 \right) \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \right) \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \right) \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \right) \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \\ &= 1 \left(P = 0, 2 \\ &= 1 \\ $	00001; r 00001; r 000001; r 0000001; r 0000001; r 0000001; r 000000000000; r 0000000000000000; r 000000000000000000000000000000000000	= 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 1 17.2% 8 1 17.2% 8 1 17.2% 8 1 12.3% 8 1 18.8% 8 1 18.8% 8 1 18.8% 8 1 18.8% 8 1 18.8% 8 1 12.3% 1 29.5% 1 29.5	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (0-24, 0.62) 0.03 (0-24, 0.62) 0.03 (0-24, 0.62) 0.03 (0-24, 0.60) 0.047 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 (-0.22, 0.23) -0.28 (-0.64, 0.69) 0.12 (0-44, 0.69) -0.28 (-0.63, 0.83)	Favours PENO Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effect: Test for subaroua diff at rest [at 12 h] Study of Study of Study of Study of Jishi 2021 Heierogeneity: Tai ² = Test for overail effect Test for overail effect	UB7 (UH* 92 1714 (P = 1 PENG CH* 1714 (P = 1 PENG CH* 1714 (P = 1 PENG CH* 1714 (P = 1 2 = 03 (P = 1)))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	8,73, df 0,08) = 8,43, (200 24 44 44 45 42 0,41) 300 12 42 42 46, df 0,11) 333 300 63 30 63 300 63 30 63 30 30 63 30 60 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 3	$ \begin{aligned} & = 7 \ (P < 0. \\ & = 0 \ (P = 0. \\ & = 1 \$	00001; r 00001; r 0,04), l ² = 3 B 5); l ² = 09 48 22 21 21 34 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	= 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 29.5% 1 18.8% 5 3 7.4% 5 9% 6 2.9% 1 18.8% 5 9% 6 2.9% 1 18.8% 1 19.7% 5 9% 6 2.9% 1 2.2% 1 2.3% 5 1	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.01 6.02, 0.82 0.33 6.02, 0.82 0.33 6.02, 0.82 0.33 6.02, 0.82 0.33 6.02, 0.82 0.47 [-1.05, 0.41] -0.84 [-1.05, 0.42] -0.85 [-1.13, 0.02] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] -0.01 [-0.52, 0.62] -0.01 [-0.52, 0.62] -0.01 [-0.52, 0.62] -0.01 [-0.52, 0.62] -0.01 [-0.52, 0.62] -0.01 [-0.53, 0.83]	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	
Test for overail effect: Test for subaroua diff at rest (rs 12 h) Study of Study ore 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Huia 2022 Study of Study of Study of Study Test for overail affect 15.1.2 UHS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Study of 2054 CO Heterogeneik, Tau'e Test for overail affect 15.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Study of Study of Study Heterogeneik, Tau'e Test for overail affect Test for overail affect Choi 2022 Hubaroua (15% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau'e Test for overail affect Choi 2022 Hubaroua (15% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau'e Test for overail affect Choi 2022 Hubaroua (15% CI) Jadon 2021 Study of Study of Study Jadon 2021	0.87; Cuhr = 2 17, 17, 16 p = 1 PENG Maan SD 0.65, 0.3 0.00; Chir = 0 2 0.03; Chir = 0 2 0.07; Chir = 0 2 0.07; Chir = 0 2 0.07; Chir = 0 2 0.07; Chir = 0 0 0; Chir = 1 2 0.07; Chir = 0 0 0; Chir = 0 0 0; Chir = 1 2 0.07; Chir = 0 0 0; Chi	8,73, d0, 0,08) = 8,43, (200 24 44 44 45 42 0,41) 300 12 42 42 46, df 0,14) 333 300 63 30 63 300 63 300 63 30 30 63 30 63 30 63 30 149 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20		00001; r; r 30 1.7 20 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 44 44 45 5; r ² = 09 46 22 21 23 34 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 4	= 90% 4 <u>Weight</u> 1 <u>10.0%</u> 1 <u>11.0%</u> 4 <u>12.3%</u> 5 <u>17.2%</u> 5 <u>17.2%</u> 5 <u>17.2%</u> 5 <u>17.2%</u> 5 <u>17.2%</u> 5 <u>17.2%</u> 5 <u>11.0%</u> 5 <u>11.0%</u> 5 <u>11.3%</u> 5 <u>13.1%</u> 5 <u></u>	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 1-0 82, 085 0 0.31 0-24, 0.801 -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.80, 0.701 -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11] -0.82 (-1.05, 0.11] -0.82 (-1.05, 0.11] -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] 0.00 (-0.62, 0.62] -0.21 (-0.44, 0.06] -0.30 (-0.74, 0.28] -0.00 (-0.48, 0.48] -0.00 (-0.48,	Favours PENG Favours FICB Siti Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	
Test for overail effect: Test for subarous diff at rest (rs 12 h) Study of Study cup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Huis 2022 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect 15.1.2 PMS Mosaffa 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect 15.1.3 Postliening Jadon 2021 Shahdar 2020 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Test for overail effect 13.1.2 Postliening Jadon 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect Test for overail effect 13.1.2 Postliening Jadon 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect 13.1.2 Postliening Jadon 2021 Studtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect 13.1.2 Postliening Jadon 2020 Studtotal (95% CI)	UB7 (UH* 2) UB7 (UH* 2) PENG Maan SD 05 03 000 (CH* 5 2 0 07 1 0 44 1 0 45 1 0 10 1 0 10 1 0 0 1 0 10 1 0 0 1	8,73, df) 0,08) = 8,43, 4 20 24 44,58, df; 0,41) 30 12 44,6, df; 0,41) 33 30 63 35,4, df; 149 9 2,22, df) 0,11) 149 9 2,22, df) 0,08) 149 9 2,22, df) 149 9 2,22, df) 149 9 2,27, df) 149 9 2,27, df) 149 9 2,27, df) 149 9 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 2,27, df) 3,30 3,30 3,30 3,30 4,30 4,47 5,30 1,30		00001; r ; r 30 1.7 20 1.3 24 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	= 90% 4 <u>Weight</u> 1 16.0% 1 17.2% 5 2 23.5% 2 23.5% 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5	Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 -0.2, 0.25 0.33 -0.24, 0.80] 0.18 -0.24, 0.80] 0.18 -0.24, 0.80] 0.18 -0.24, 0.80] -0.70 -1.27, -0.13] -0.10 -0.30, 0.70] -0.47 -1.05, 0.11] -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34] -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] 0.01 -0.45, 0.45] -0.01 -0.45, 0.45] -0.01 -0.45, 0.45] -0.01 -0.45, 0.45] -0.01 -0.45, 0.45] -0.01 -0.46, 0.24] -0.01 -0.46, 0.24]	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	
Test for overail effect: Test for subarous diff at rest [st 12, h] Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau? Test for overail affect 15.1.2 PMS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau? Test for overail affect 15.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau? Test for overail affect Test for overail affect 13.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Shabotal 2025 CI) Heterogeneik; Tau? Test for overail affect Test for overail affect	0.87; Cuhr = 1, 174 (a) = - PENG CM - 174 (b) = - PENG CM - 174 (b) = - PENG CM - 174 (b) = - 2 = 0.34 (c) = - 2 =	8,73, d0 0,08) = 8,43, 4 20 24 44,58, df 0,41) 12 22,46, df 0,41) 30 12 42,46, df 0,41) 149 2,22, d0 0,14) = 5,39, 170 tal 20 2,44, df 19 20 2,44, df 19 20 2,24, df 20 2,27, df 20 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,27, df 2,33, df 3,30 3,30 3,30 3,30 3,42, df 19 3,42, df 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19 19	$ \begin{aligned} & = 7 \ (P \ e) \ (q \ e) \ (q) \ (q \ e) \ (q \ e) \ (q \ e) \ (q \ e) \ (q \ e)$	00001; r ; 50 Total 50 T	= 90% = 90% 1 Weight 1 10.0% 1 7.1% 1 17.1% 1 7.1% 1 7.1% 1 7.1% 1 7.1% 1 7.1% 1 7.1% 1 7.2% 1 7.2% 1 7.2% 1 7.2% 1 7.2% 1 8.7% % 1 8.7% 1 8.7% 2 8.7% 1 8.7%	Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 L0 62, 0.621 0.33 L0 24, 0.621 0.33 L0 24, 0.621 0.34 L0 24, 0.601 0.18 [-0.24, 0.60] 0.070 [-1.27, -0.13] -0.10 [-0.080, 0.701 -0.47 [-1.05, 0.11] -0.84 [-1.35, -0.34] -0.84 [-1.35, -0.34] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] 0.12 [-0.44, 0.69] 0.12 [-0.44, 0.69] -0.29 [-0.43, 0.48] 0.00 [-0.48, 0.48] -0.23 [-0.46, 0.48] -0.24 [-0.46, 0.48	10	10
Test for overail effect: Test for subarouo diff at rest [st 12, h] Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Test for overail effect 15.1.2 PMS Mosafia 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Test for overail effect 15.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Test for overail effect Test for overail effect 15.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik, Tau ² = Shankar 2020 Shankar 2020	UB7 (UH* 9) UB7 (UH* 9) UB7 (UH* 9) PENG WH Non SD S 0 3 000 (CH* 9) 2 078	8,73, d0,008) = 8,43, d 20 24 44 44 45,58, df: 0,41) 30 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42	$ \begin{array}{c} = 7 \ (P = 0, c \\ \hline \text{RCm} & \text{S} \\ \hline \text{Mean} & \text{S} \\ 1, 5, 3 \\ 3, 91 \\ 1, 5, 3 \\ 2, 17 \\ 0, 4 \\$	0.000(1); r = 0 0.00(1); r = 0; r = 0 0.00(1); r = 0; r = 0 0.00(1); r	= = 90% = 44.% = Weight = 17.2% = 17.2% = 17.2% = 17.2% = 12.3% % = 100.0% % = 100.0% = 37.4% = 100.0% = 37.4% = 100.0% = 37.4% = 100.0% = 37.4% = 100.0% =	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (-0.42, 0.62) 0.03 (-0.42, 0.62) 0.03 (-0.42, 0.63) -0.70 (-1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (-0.00, -0.13) -0.47 (-1.05, 0.11) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.44, 0.68) -0.29 (-0.66, 0.83) 0.00 (-0.62, 0.03) 0.12 (-0.44, 0.68) -0.29 (-0.46, 0.48) -0.29 (-0.46, 0.48) -0.21 (-0.46,	Favours PENO Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effect: Test for subarous diff. at rest [at 12, h] Study of Study of Study of Study of Study of Study of Study of Heierogeneity, Tay 2 Study at Study of Study of Heierogeneity, Tay 2 Test for overail effect Test for overail effect	UBY: Curr = 2 UBY: Curr = 2 PENG Mean SD 2 0 03 (P = 1 3 01 100 3 01 000 Curr = 2 2 0 13 (P = 1 2 0 13	8,73, d0,008) = 8,43, d 20 24 24 44 45,58, df: 0,41) 30 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42	$ \begin{array}{c} {}_{=}7 (P = 0, c \\ {}_{=}6 (P = 0, c \\ {}_{=}6 (P = 0, c \\ {}_{=}1 (P = 0, 1 \\ {}_{=}3, 0 \\ {}_{=}1 (P = 0, 1 \\ {}_{=}1 (P = 0, 1 \\ {}_{=}1 (P = 0, 2 \\ {}_{=}1 (P = 0, 1 \\ {}_{=}1 (P = 0, 2 \\ {}_{=$	000001; P; = 3 5D Total 5D Total 5D Total 5D Total 40 22 22 12 34 44 45 46 33 48 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57 57	= = 90% = 44% = Weight = 10.0% = 17.2% = 17.2% = 17.2% = 17.2% = 17.2% = 33.1% = 33.1% = 33.1% = 33.4% = 100.0% = 400.0% = 400.0%	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 L0 82, 0.821 0.33 L0 24, 0.801 -0.70 L1 27, -0.13 -0.10 L0 80, 0.701 -0.47 L1.05, 0.341 -0.84 L1 35, -0.341 -0.84 L1 35, -0.341 -0.95 L1 32, -0.44, -0.891 -0.32 L1 20, -0.821 -0.32 L1 12, -0.481 -0.32 L1 12, -0.481 -0.32 L1 12, -0.481 -0.32 L1 12, -0.481 -0.32 L1 20, -0.481 -0.32 L1 2	To source PEND Favours PICB Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effect: Test for subarouo diff at rest (at 12 h) Study of Study ore 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hula 2022 Studtata (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect 15.1.2 PMS Mosafia 2021 Shatkata (202) Studtata (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'e Test for overail effect Test for overail effect 13.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subtota (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau'= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 DMS	UB7 (Unit 9) UB7 (Unit 9) PENG Maan SD PENG Maan SD 0.00 (Chill = 0 20 00 (Ch	8,73, d0,008) = 8,43, (<u>Total</u> 20 24 44 458, df- 0,41) 30 0,24 44 44 458, df- 0,41) 30 12 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 42 4	$ \begin{array}{c} = 7 \ (P < 0 \\ \text{Mean} & S \\ 1 \\ = 3 \\ 1 \\ = 1 \\$	000001; P 3 5D Total 5D Total 3 5D Total 3 48 22 22 12 34 48 22 22 12 34 48 33 31, P = 31 48 33 31, P = 31 48 33 31, P = 31 48 33 31, P = 31 48 33 31, P = 51 50, P = 00 50, P	= 90% 64.4% i Weight 1 16.0% 5 17.2% 5 29.5% 1 10.8% 5 29.5% 6 2.9% i 10.0% 6 2.9% i 00.0% 5 26.1% 1 37.2% 5 3 3 13.1% 5 3 3 26.1% 5 3 2 24.0% 5 3 2 24.0% 5 3 2 24.0% 5 3 2 2 11.2% 5 3 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 -0.2, 0.25% 0.33 -0.24, 0.30] 0.18 -0.24, 0.40] 0.18 -0.24, 0.40] -0.70 -1.27, -0.13] -0.10 -0.00, 0.70] -0.47 -1.05, 0.11] -0.84 -1.35, -0.34] -0.28 -0.76, 0.25] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.66, 0.09] -0.28 -0.76, 0.25% -0.00 -0.26, 0.43, 0.43] 0.00 -0.26, 0.43, 0.43] -0.00 -0.26, 0.43, 0.43] -0.01 -0.46, 0.24] -0.22 -112, 0.46, 0.24] -0.22 -112, 0.47, 1.51] 0.43 -1.00, 1.45]	Favours PENO Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% Cl	10
Test for overail effect: Test for subarous diff at rest [12, h] Study of Study coup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hula 2022 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau" Test for overail effect 15.1.2 PMS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 15.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Senthi 2021 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Test for overail effect 13.1.3 PMS Natrajan 2022 Studtati (SSK CI) Heterogeneik; Tau"= Studtati	U 2017 Chr = 1 174 (P = 1 PENG Mean SD 000 Chr = 0 20 0 1 21 14 (P = 1 22 0 3 (P = 1 2 0 0 (P = 1)))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	8,73, d0,008) = 8,43, (<u>Total</u> 20 24 44 458, df 0,41) 30 0,24 44 44 458, df 0,41) 30 12 422 42, 46, df 13 30 30 30 46, df 14 9 22,22, df 0,01) 149 22,22, df 0,01) 149 22,22, df 0,01) 149 22,22, df 0,03) 149 24,22, df 0,05) 149 2,22, df 0,05) 142 2,22, df 0,05) 142 2,22, df 0,05) 142 2,22, df 0,05) 142 2,22, df 0,05) 142 2,22, df 0,05) 142 2,22, df 12,22, df 12,22, df 13,33 1,54, df 1,22,23, df 1,23 1,22, df 1,23 1,23 1,24 1,25 1	$ \begin{array}{l} {}^{}_{}=7\ (P\ < 0, \\ {}^{}_{}=3\ (P\ = 0, \ \ {}^{}_$	000001; P = 1 SD Total SD Total S	= = 90% 64.4% 1 Weight 1 16.0% 1 7.7% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 12.3% 5 1 12.3% 5 1 12.3% 5 1 22.5% 5 1 12.3% 5 1 10.0% 5 1 12.2% 5 1 12.2% 5 1 10.0% 5 1 12.6% 5 1 2 2.4% 5 1 12.6% 5 2 2.4% 5 1 12.6% 5 1 2 2.4% 5 1 2 2.4% 1 2 2.4%	Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.2, 0.62] 0.31 0.24, 0.62] -0.70 [+1.27, -0.13] -0.10 [-0.30, 0.70] -0.47 [-1.05, -0.14] -0.84 [+1.35, -0.34] -0.84 [+1.35, -0.34] -0.85 [+1.13, 0.02] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 [-0.66, 0.09] 0.12 [-0.44, 0.68] -0.39 [-2.83, 0.33] 0.00 [-0.48, 0.48] -0.32 [+1.12, 0.48] -1.14 [0.47, 1.81] 0.43 [-1.00, 1.85]	10	10
Test for overail effect: Test for subarouo diff. at rest [at 12, h] Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Test for overail at Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Test for overail offect 15.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Test for overail effect Test for overail effect 13.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Shahatar 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Study or Subgroup Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Study or Subgroup Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Test for overail effect 13.1.0 HS Natajan 2021 Sanktar 2020 Sombit 2021 Shahatar 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneik; Tau ² =: Test for overail effect 13.1.0 HS Natajan 2021 Shahatar 2020 Shahatar 2020 Shaha	UB7 (UH* 2) UB7 (8,73, d0,008) - 0,069) - 0,069 - 0,069 - 20 - 24 - 44 - 44 - 58, d7 	$ \begin{array}{c} = 7 \ (P < 0, \\ \text{Mean} & S \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \ (P = 0, \\ 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 0 \\ = 1 \\ = 1 \\ = 0 \\ $	000001); P SD Total SD T	= 90% 64.4% Weight 1 10.0% 3 17.2% 3 17.2% 3 17.2% 4 12.3% 5 11.2.3% 5 11.2.	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.047 (-1.05, 0-34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.44, 0-89) 0.12 (-0.44, 0-89) 0.12 (-0.44, 0-89) -0.23 (-0.74, 0.28) -0.34 (-0.24) -0.24 (-1.04, 0.48) -0.22 (-1.12, 0.49) -0.32 (-1.12, 0.49)	Favours PENO Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effect: Test for suberoup diff at rest for suberoup diff at rest for suberoup diff Attist for suberoup diff Natist 2021 Helerogeneity: Tay ² = Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Test for overail effect Subbola (BSN: Cu) Helerogeneity: Tay ² = Test for overail effect Test for overail effect	USP: Curr 92 USP: Curr 92 PENG Corr 15 4 44 Mean SD 20 000; Chrl 92 20 000 000; Chrl 92 20 000 01 000 20 00 20	8.73, d0 0.06) Total 20 24 44 458, d7 0.41) 30 12 24, 46, d7 0.41) 30 12 24, 46, d7 0.41) 33 30 63 53, 64, d7 0.41) 33 30 63 53, 64, d7 0.41) 33 30 63 53, 64, d7 0.41) 33 30 63 53, 64, d7 0.41) 33 30 63 30 0.42, d7 7, 29, d7 0.42, d7 0.42, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.43, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.42, d7 0.43, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.44, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.44, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.44, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.44, d7 0.44, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.43, d7 0.44, d7 0.41) 33 30 0.42, d7 0.44, d7 0.54, d7 0.44, d7 0.54, d7 0.44, d7 0.44, d7 0.54, d7 0.55, d7	$ \begin{array}{c} = 7 \ (P \ 0. \\ \text{Mean} & \text{S} \\ 1 \ 5 \ 3 \ 0. \\ 1 \ 5 \ 5 \ 1 \ 5 \ 5 \ 1 \ 5 \ 5 \ 1 \ 5 \ 5$	000001; P 3 SD Total SD	= 90% 64.4% i Weight 1 16.0% 5 17.2% 6 1 17.1% 229.5% 6 1 18.8% 6 1 18.8% 6 2 29.5% 1 18.8% 6 2 2 2 5% 1 2 7% 6 2 2 2 5% 1 2 7% 1 2 2 5% 1 2 7% 1 2 3% 1 3 3% 1	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (0-20, 0-22) 0.03 (0-20, 0-22) 0.03 (0-20, 0-22) 0.03 (0-20, 0-22) 0.047 (1-27, 0-13) -0.16 (0-80, 0-70) -0.47 (1-85, 0-34) -0.84 (1-35, 0-34) -0.84 (1-35, 0-34) -0.84 (1-35, 0-34) -0.84 (1-35, 0-34) -0.28 (0-66, 0.09) -0.28 (0-	Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effect: Test for suberoup diff. at rest for suberoup diff. at rest for suberoup diff. Attest for suberoup diff. Attest for overail effect Test for overail effect	US7 Curh = 2 US7 Curh = 2 FENG Mann SD = 1 FENG Mann SD = 1 S = 44 S = 54 S = 44 S = 54 S =	8.73, df 0.08) 200 201 202 204 204 204 204 205 205 205 205 205 205 205 205		000001); P = 3 SD Total SD Total	= 90% 64.4% i Weight 1 16.0% 1 7.1% 2 29.5% 1 12.8% 9 % 1 10.8% 1 10.0% 1 10.0% 1 10.0% 1 10.0% 1 10.0% 1 10.0% 1 10.0% 1 10.0%	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.03 (0-24, 0-82) 0.01 (0-00, 0-70) -0.10 (0-00, 0-70) -0.47 (-1.05, 0-14) -0.84 (-1.35, 0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, 0.34) -0.84 (-1.42, 0-26) -0.84 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.84 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.84 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.85 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.84 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.85 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.84 (-1.42, -0.26) -0	To source PICB Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	10
Test for overail effect: Test for suberoup diff at rest for suberoup diff at rest for suberoup diff at rest for suberoup 15.11 HAA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 15.12 Physike Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 15.13 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 13.12 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 13.12 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 13.12 Positionous Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 13.12 Positionous Jaton 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneik, Tau" = Test for overail effect 13.13 DHS Subtotal (95% C) Subtotal (95% C)	UB7 (UH* 2) UB7 (UH* 2) PENG Maan SD PENG Maan SD 0.00 (CH* 5 2 - 0.03 (CH* 5 2 - 0	8.73, df 0.08) 200 24 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	$ \begin{array}{c} {}_{q=7} = (P \in 0, \\ {}_{q=0} = 0, \\ {}_{q=0} = 1, \\ {}_{q=0} = 0, \\ {}_{q=0} = 1, \\ {$	000001; P = 3 SD Total SD Total	= = 90% 64.4% i Weight 1 16.0% 5 17.2% 3 13.1% 62.9% 4 Weight 1 18.8% 5 12.7% 62.9% 4 Weight 1 18.8% 5 12.7% 5 1	Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI 0.00 1-02, 023 0.31 0-24, 020 0.118 (-0.24, 0.40) 0.118 (-0.24, 0.40) 0.118 (-0.24, 0.40) -0.70 (+1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (+0.00, 0.70) -0.47 (+1.05, -0.34) -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (+1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.46, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.46, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.46, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.46, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.46, 0.04) -0.39 (-0.46, 0.48) -0.39 (-0.46, 0.24) -0.39 (-0.46, 0.24) -0.31 (-0.46, 0.24) -0.32 (+1.12, 0.49) 1.14 (0.47, 1.81) 0.31 (-1.06, 0.34) -0.34 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.36 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.36 (-1.42, 0.23)	Favours PENO Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effect: study of subgroup 15.11 HIA Aliste 2021 15.11 HIA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = Test for overail effect 15.12 DHS Mosafia 2021 Natrajan 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.13 Desilioning Jadon 2021 Sharkaz 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.13 Desilioning Jadon 2021 Sharkaz 2020 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.17 HAA Aliste 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.17 HAA Aliste 2021 Chai 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.17 HOA Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.17 HOA Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.17 HAA Heterogeneity, Tau ² = 15.17 HOA Heterogeneity, Tau ² =	USP (Unit = 2) USP (Unit = 2) PENG Mean SD SD 301 (Different SD 301 (Different SD 3	8.73, df 0.08) 200 24 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44 44	$ \begin{aligned} & = 1 \ (P < 0, \\ & \text{Mean} \ & S \ (P = 0, \\ & \text{Mean} \ & S$	000001; F SD Total SD T	= 90% 64.4% (Weight 1 16.0% 5 17.2% 5 17.2% 6 18.8% 1 18.8%	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (0.24, 0.82) 0.03 (0.24, 0.82) 0.07 (1.27, -0.13) -0.10 (0.80, 0.70) -0.47 (-1.05, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09] 0.12 (-0.44, 0.68) -0.90 (-2.83, 0.83) 0.00 (-0.48, 0.48) -0.32 (-1.12, 0.49) -0.32 (-1.12, 0.49) -0.32 (-1.12, 0.49) -0.32 (-1.12, 0.49) -0.32 (-1.12, 0.49) -0.34 (-1.42, -0.26) -0.36 (-1.92, 0.31)	Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Test for overail effect: Test for suberoup diff at rest (a12.h) Study or Subgroup 15.1.1 HA Aliste 2021 Heat for suberoup diff rest for overail effect 15.1.2 DHS Mosafia 2021 Narajan 2021 Subdrat (15% C) Heat organeity. Tay ² = Test for overail effect 15.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subdrat (15% C) Heat organeity. Tay ² = Test for overail effect 13.1.3 Positioning Jadon 2021 Shankar 2020 Subdrat (15% C) Heat organeity. Tay ² = Test for overail effect 13.1.1 HA Aliste 2021 Chai 2022 Shankar 2020 Shankar 202	US7 (UP* 2) US7 (8,73, d0 0,08) 200 24 4 4,54, d7 200 24 4,54, d7 12 4,58, d7 0,041) 30 30 4,54, d7 12 4,54, d7 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12 12	$ \begin{array}{c} {} {} {} {} {} {} {} {} {} {} {} {} {}$	000001; F = 3 SD Total SD Total S	= 90% 64.4% Weight 1 16.0% 5 17.2% 5 1 18.7% 5 1 18.7% 5 1 13.0% 5 1 13.0% 5 1 2.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 18.7% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 17.2% 5 1 2.7% 5 1 2.7% 5	Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.03 (-0.42, 0.62) 0.03 (-0.42, 0.62) 0.03 (-0.42, 0.62) 0.03 (-0.42, 0.63) 0.047 (-1.05, 0.14) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.84 (-1.35, -0.34) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.44, 0.69) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.44, 0.69) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.44, 0.69) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) 0.12 (-0.44, 0.69) -0.28 (-0.66, 0.09) -0.28 (-0.76,	To Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% Cl To Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% Cl Std. Mean Difference N, Random	

Supplementary Figure 5: Forest plot for pain score at rest within 30 min, at 6 h, 12 h and 24 h in different types of surgeries

MUTDID 201 DUD LOD DOULO	mont) PE	NG		F	ICB			Std. Mean Difference	Std. Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
Jadon 2021	4 0	.74	33	5	0.74	33	11.3%	-1.34 [-1.87, -0.80]	-	
Kulkarni 2021	1.87 0	.82	30	2.23	0.93	30	11.4%	-0.41 [-0.92, 0.11]		
Shankar 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	0.6	0.4	30 93	2.6	1.2	30 93	11.0% 33.6%	-2.21 [-2.86, -1.56] -1.30 [-2.29, -0.31]	•	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.69; Chi ²	= 18.7	1, df	= 2 (P <	0.000	01); I² =	89%			
l est for overall effect:	Z = 2.56 (F	$P = 0.0^{\circ}$	1)							
11.1.2 DHS			~~						L	
Nosaffa 2021 Natrajan 2021	2.93 0	0.8	30	2.82	0.78	12	11.3%	0.82 [-0.02, 1.66]	T-	
Subtotal (95% CI)			42			34	21.7%	0.39 [-0.29, 1.07]	•	
Test for overall effect:	0.12; Chi ² Z = 1.13 (F	= 1.92, P = 0.2	, df = 6)	1 (P = (0.17);	12 = 485	%			
			- /							
Hua 2022	3.8	0.9	24	5.4	0.8	24	10.9%	-1.85 [-2.53, -1.16]	-	
Vamshi 2023	3 1	.48	30	4	1.48	30	11.3%	-0.67 [-1.19, -0.15]	-	
Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.60: Chi2	= 7.24	54 df =	1 (P = (0.0071	54 1 ² = 8f	22.2%	-1.24 [-2.39, -0.08]	-	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.09 (F	P = 0.0	4)		,					
11.1.4 PENA										
Kong 2022	9 2	.22	25	8	1.48	25	11.2%	0.52 [-0.04, 1.09]	-	
Subtotal (95% CI)	olicable		25			25	11.2%	0.52 [-0.04, 1.09]	•	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.81 (F	P = 0.0	7)							
11 1 5 IT/Arthroplast										
kalashetty 2022	3.29 0	.73	45	5.11	0.71	45	11.2%	-2.51 [-3.06, -1.95]	-	
Subtotal (95% CI)			45			45	11.2%	-2.51 [-3.06, -1.95]	•	
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable Z = 8.81 (F	P < 0.0	0001)						
T							100 001			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.19: Chi2	= 114	259 82 d	f = 8 (P	< 0.00	251 0001): I	100.0% ² = 93%	-0.84 [-1.58, -0.10]	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 2.23 (F	P = 0.03	3)				0010		-10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Test for subgroup diffe	erences: Cl	hi² = 70	0.25,	df = 4 (F	P < 0.0	00001).	l ² = 94.39	6		
at 6 h (on movement)		ING						Std Moon Differen	Std Mean Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD T	otal	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI	
13.1.1 THA			~							
Aliste 2021 Choi 2022	3 6	0.3	20	3	5.18	20	16.7% 15.9%	0.00 [-0.62, 0.62]	- T	
Hua 2022	0.8	0.6	24	0.7	0.4	24	16.9%	0.19 [-0.37, 0.76]	+	
Vamshi 2023 Subtotal (95% CI)	3 1	1.48	30	4	1.48	30	17.1%	-0.67 [-1.19, -0.15] -0.81 [-1.98, 0.36]	-	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	1.32; Chi ²	= 44.1	0, df	= 3 (P <	< 0.00	001); I ²	= 93%		-	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.36 (P = 0.1	7)							
13.1.2 Positioning										
Jadon 2021	1 1	1.48	33	1	1.48	33	17.2%	0.00 [-0.48, 0.48]	±	
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable		33			33	17.270	0.00 [-0.46, 0.46]	Ť	
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.00 (P = 1.0	0)							
13.1.3 PENA										
Kong 2022	2 1	1.48	25	6	2.22	25	16.3%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39]	Ŧ	
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap	2 1 plicable	1.48	25 25	6	2.22	25 25	16.3% 16.3%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39]	÷	
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1	1.48 P < 0.0	25 25	6	2.22	25 25	16.3% 16.3%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39]	*	
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (I	I.48 P < 0.0	25 25 10001 159	6	2.22	25 25 159	16.3% 16.3% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01]	*	
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l	1.48 P < 0.0 ¹ = 67.3	25 25 100001 159 16, df	6) = 5 (P <	2.22	25 25 159 001); I ²	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01]	÷	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subround iffect:	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l	P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3, 23	6) = 5 (P <	2.22 < 0.00	25 25 159 001); I ²	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01]	+10 +5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l erences: C	1.48 P < 0.0 ² = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23,	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f	2.22 < 0.00 P < 0.0	25 25 159 001); I ² 00001).	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% , J ² = 91.4 ⁴	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01]	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at 12 h (on moveme	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l erences: C	1.48 P < 0.0 F = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23,	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (I	2.22 < 0.00 P < 0.0 FICB	25 25 159 001); I ² 00001).	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% . I ² = 91.4 ⁴	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diffe at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1 11 Hz	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 ((1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 () erences: C ent) PE Mean	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, [*] otal	6)) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f Mean	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD	25 25 159 001); I ² 00001). Total	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% , ² = 91.4 ⁴ Weight	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subgroup diffe at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 HAA Aliste 2021	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 ((1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 () erences: C <u>Mean</u> 2.5 5	1.48 P < 0.0 ² = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, <u>otal</u> 20	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 3	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44	25 25 159 0001); I ² 000001). <u>Total</u> 20	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% , I ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, <u>95% CI</u> -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53]	+10 +5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 ((1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 () erences: C mt) pE Mean 2.5 ξ 0.9 0.9	P < 0.0 r = 67.3 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ r = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ r = 0.0 r = 0.0 $hi^2 = 0.0$ r = 0.0 r = 0.0 $hi^2 = 0.0$ $hi^2 = 0.0$	25 25 00001 159 96, df 15) 3.23, iotal 20 24	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f <u>Mean</u> 3 1	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4	25 25 159 001); I ² 00001). <u>Total</u> 20 24	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% , ² = 91.4 ⁴ Weight 28.2% 33.1%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-9.31, 0.32]	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% Cl	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% Cl) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Test for soverall effect: Test for soverall effect: Test for subaroup diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 THA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vamshi 2023 Subtotal (95% Cl)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l erences: C mean 2.5 { 0.9 3 1	I.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48	25 25 000001 159 06, df 05) 3.23, ^{(otal} 20 24 30 74	6) = 5 (P < 1 Mean 3 1 4	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48	25 25 159 001); I ² 00001). <u>Total</u> 20 24 30 74	16.3% 16.3% = 93% , ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference W, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02]	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for suberoup diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TM Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Varishi 2023 Subtotal (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (i erences: C mean 2.5 { 0.9 3 1 = 0.01; Chi ²	1.48 P < 0.0 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 ² = 2.19	25 25 00001 159 96, df 15) 3.23, ⁷ otal 20 24 30 74 9, df	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (F Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P =	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33);	25 25 159 0001); I ² 000001). Total 20 24 30 74 ; I ² = 9%	16.3% 16.3% = 93% I ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference <i>N</i> , Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.27] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02]	+10 -5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 H/A Aliste 2021 Hus 2022 Vamshi 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Test for overall effect	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l prences: C men 2.5 5 0.9 3 1 = 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (l	I.48 P < 0.0 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 I.48 P = 0.0	25 25 900001 159 96, df 15) 3.23, ^c otal 20 24 30 74 9, df= 14)	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P =	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33);	25 25 159 001); l ² 00001). Total 20 24 30 74 ; l ² = 9%	16.3% 16.3% = 93% , ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference //, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.32] -0.67 [-1.19, 0.32]	+10 +5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% Cl	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Tost (95% C) Heterogeneity: Taul effect Test for verall affect Test for verall affect Test for subgroup 16.1.11HA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vanehl 2023 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Taul effect 16.1.2 Positioning	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (l 1.14; Chi ^p Z = 1.93 (l prences: C Mean 2.5 { 0.9 3 1 = 0.01; Chi ^r Z = 2.10 (1.48 P < 0.0 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ $hi^2 = 33$ $hi^2 = 33$ h	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 3.23, otal 20 24 30 74 9, df = 14)	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (P <u>Mean</u> 3 1 4 = 2 (P =	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33);	25 25 159 0001); I ² 000001), <u>Total</u> 20 24 30 74 74 5 ; I ² = 9%	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% I ² = 91.4 ⁴ Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference W. Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02]	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
kong 2022 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect: 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (f) 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l erences: C mt) pE Mean 2.5 $\frac{6}{0.9}$ 3 1 = 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (4	1.48 P < 0.0 ¹ = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 1.48 P = 0.0 0 0	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23. ^c otal 20 24 30 74 9, df= 14) 33 33	6)) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11	25 25 0001); l ² 000001), Total 20 24 30 74 74 30 74 33 33 33	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% , l ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.32] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable	+10 -5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for suboroue diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TM Allete 2021 Hua 2022 Varnshi 2023 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Postioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (f) 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (l erences: C (erences:	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 * = 2.15 P = 0.0 0	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, ^{(otal} 20 24 30 74 9, df = 14) 33	6)) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB 5D 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11	25 25 0001); i ² 00001), 70 20 24 30 74 74 30 74 33 33 33	16.3% 16.3% = 93% ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference <i>N</i> , Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.27] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable	+10 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect: Test for subbroup diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 H/A Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vamshi (2023) Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not at Test for overall effect	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 ((1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 () erences: C (erences: C	I.48 P < 0.0 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 P = 0.0 0 0 cable	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 00tal 20 24 30 24 30 74 9, df = 14) 33 33	6) = 5 (P < df = 2 (f Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11	25 25 159 0001); I ² 000001), Total 20 24 30 74 74 33 33	16.3% 16.3% = 93% ² = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference //, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.32] -0.67 [-1.19, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable	+10 +5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overal effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau" = Test for subaroux diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.11HA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau" = Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Rau" Fest for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtola (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; ChP Z = 1.93 (i prences: C met) PE Mean 2.5 6 0.9 3 1 = 0.01; ChF Z = 2.10 (i 4 oplicable Not applic	1.48 P < 0.0 P = 0.0 P = 0.0 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 $x^2 = 2.15$ 0 0 cable	25 25 00001 159 6, df (5) 3.23, 7 0 24 30 74 9, df 9, df 9, df 9, df 33 33 33	6 1) df = 2 (l Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11	25 25 159 0001); ² 000001), Total 20 24 30 74 ; ² = 9% 33 33 33	16.3% 16.3% = 93% = 93% Weight 28.2% 33.1% 38.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference (W, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02]	+10 +5 0 5 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Test for overall effect: Test for overall effect: at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vansh 2023 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overall effect: 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not act Test for overall effect: Chall (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not act Test for overall effect: Test for over	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (i prences: C Mean 2.5 5 0.9 3 1 = 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (i 4 oplicable Not applicable = 0.01; Chi ² = 0.01; Chi ²	1.48 P < 0.0 r = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 $r^2 = 2.15$ 0 cable $r^2 = 2.15$	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 70 20 24 30 74 9, df 33 33 33 107 9, df	6 1) 1) 1 1 1 4 1 2 (P = 3 1 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 2 (P =	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.1 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11	25 25 159 0001); l ² 000001), <u>Total</u> 20 24 30 74 30 74 33 33 33 107 [² = 9%	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% P = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 5	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, -0.95] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02]	+10 -5 0 5	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau* = Test for overall effect: Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TM Heterogeneity: Tau* = Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not aj Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau* = Test for overall effect Test for overall effect	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.93 (i erences: C Mean 2.5 6 0.9 3 1 = 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (i 4 oplicable Not applici Z = 2.10 (i ferences: 1	1.48 P < 0.0 r = 67.3 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ NG SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 $r^2 = 2.15$ 0 cable $r^2 = 2.15$ P = 0.0 NO NO NO P = 0.0	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 20 24 30 74 9, df 33 33 33 107 79, df 107	6 1) = 5 (P < 0 df = 2 (1 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 3 2 (P = 2) 3 3 2 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3 3	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33);	25 25 159 0001); l ² 000001), <u>Total</u> 20 24 30 74 30 74 33 33 33 107 (l [*] = 9%	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 33.7% 33.7% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference <i>N</i> , Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.25] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable	Tavours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect test for suborou effit at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1 THA Aliste 2021 Vammi 2023 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect Test for suboroup diffect Test for suboroup diffect	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i Z = 5.85 (i Z = 1.93 (i) Z = 1.93 (i) Z = 1.93 (i) Z = 2.10 (i)	1.48 P < 0.0 r = 67.3 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ NG SD T 0.4 1.48 $r^2 = 2.15$ P = 0.0 0 cable $r^2 = 2.15$ P = 0.0 Not approximately a state of the state of	25 25 100001 159 16, df 5) 3.23,	6 1) = 5 (P < 0 df = 2 (1 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICP	25 25 159 0001); i ² 00001). Total 20 24 30 74 74 33 33 33 107 i ² = 9%	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% 1 ² = 93% 1 ² = 91.4 ⁴ 28.2% 33.1% 33.7% 33.7% 100.0% 5	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference //, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.32] -0.67 [-1.19, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02]	+10 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5 +5	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for overal effect test for subaroux diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.11HA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tay = 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtola (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tay = test for overall effect total (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tay = test for overall effect Total (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tay = Subtola (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tay = test for overall effect Test for subaroux diff at 10.4 (on moveme Study or Subgroup	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ¹ H Z = 1.93 (i 2 = 5.85 (i Mean 2.5 6 0.9 3 1 0.01; Chi ² Chi 2.2 = 2.10 (i 4 bplicable bplicable col1; Chi ² Chi 2.2 = 2.10 (i 4 bplicable col1; Chi ² Chi 2.2 = 2.10 (i 4 col1; Chi 3.2 = 2.10 (i 4 col1; Chi 4.2 = 2.10 (i 4.2 = 2.10 (i	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 [≠] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [≠] = 2.15 P = 0.0 Not app Not app SD T	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 20 24 30 24 30 74 9, df 107 9, df 107 9, df 107 9, df 107 107	6 1) 1) 1 1 1 4 1 2 (P = 3 1 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 4 2 (P = 4 2 (P = 4 2 (P = 4 2 (P = 4 (P = (P = (2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD	25 25 159 0001); i ² 00001). Total 20 24 30 74 30 74 33 33 33 107 i ² = 9% 107 i ² = 9%	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% IP = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 5 100.0% 5	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.32] -0.67 [-1.19, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference V, Random, 95% CI	+10 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
kong 2022 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vansh 2023 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Jadon 2021 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Nat Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Study or Subgroup 12.1.1 Tubgroup	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ¹ Z = 1.93 (i) Z = 1.93 (i) mean 2.5 § 0.9 0.9 0.1 Chi ⁻ Not appli 0.01; Chi ⁻ 0.01; Chi	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 [≠] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [≠] = 2.15 P = 0.0 Not appr Not appr SD T	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 20 24 30 74 9, df 33 33 33 107 9, df 9, df 107 9, df 107	6 1) = 5 (P < 1 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 3 = 2 (P = 3 Mean 1 4 - - - - - - - - - - - - -	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.333); 1.11 0.333); FICB SD	25 25 00001); i ² 000001), 700001), 700001), 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 300 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% P = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 33.7% 500.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, -0.39] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI	+10 Favours PENG Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI Favours PENO Favours PENO Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtatal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: 16.12 Opstional (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) adot 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Test for overail effect: Total (95% C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Charles C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Charles C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Charles C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Charles C) Atterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overail effect: Test for overail effect: Test for overail effect: Test for overai	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14: Chi ² X = 1.93 (i Z = 1.93 (i Mean 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 0.9 3.1 2.5 § 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 $\vec{z} = 2.15$ P = 0.0 0 cable $\vec{z} = 2.15$ P = 0.0 0 cable $\vec{z} = 2.15$ P = 0.0 SD T $\vec{z} = 0.0$ $\vec{z} = 0.0$	25 25 00001 159 6, df (5) 3.23, 74 33 33 74 9, df (4) 9, df (4) 9, df (4) 9, df (4) 9, df (5) 3.23, 74 9, df (5) 74 9, df (5) 74 9, df (6) 74 9, df (7) 74 9, df (7) 74 9, df (7) 74 9, df (7) 74 9, df (7) 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74	6 1) = 5 (P < df = 2 (l Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 3 = 2 (P = 3 3 4 = 2 (P = 3 3 4 2 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6 6	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.1 FICB SD 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5	25 25 00001); ² 00001), 20 24 30 74 33 33 33 107 (² = 9% 107 (² = 9% 107 20 27 20 27 20 27 20 27	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% P = 93% P = 91.4' VWeight 100.0% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference <i>N</i> , Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.25] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference <i>N</i> , Random, 95% CI -0.00 [-0.2, 0.85] -0.39 [-0.10, -1.88]	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENO Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENO Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect: at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TM Aliste 2021 Varishi 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect: 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect: Total (95% C) Alterogeneity: Tau' = Test for overall effect: Test for ov	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (i 2.5 § 0.9 3 1 2.5 \$ 0.5	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 $\vec{z} = 2.15$ P = 0.0 0 cable $\vec{z} = 2.15$ P = 0.0 0 cable $\vec{z} = 2.15$ P = 0.0 0 cable $\vec{z} = 2.15$ 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	25 25 00001 159 66, df (5) 3.23, 7 20 24 30 74 9, df = 14) 33 33 33 33 33 107 9, df = 14) phical (otal 20 24 24 30 74 9, df 159 24 30 74 24 20 74 24 20 74 24 33 33 33 33 33 20 74 20 7 20 7	6 6 1) 1) 1 1 1 4 2 (P = 3 1 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 1.7) 2 (P = 1.	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.1 FICB SD 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1.1	25 25 0001); l ² 000001). <u>Total</u> 30 74 30 74 33 33 33 107 [² = 9% <u>74</u> 33 33 33	16.3% 100.0% = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 38.7% 38.7% 5 000.0% 6 Weight 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.35] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.00 [-0.62, 0.63] -2.39 [-3.10, -1.68] -0.11 [-0.46, 0.67]	+10 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for overal effect test for subaroux diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.11M Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tay = Test for subaroux diff test for overal effect test for subaroux diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 12.1.11MA Aliste 2021 Choi 2021 Choi 2022 Vameh (on moveme Study or Subgroup 12.1.11MA Aliste 2021 Choi 2022 Vameh (2% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ² + 5.85 (i 2 = 5.85 (i 2 = 5.85 (i 0.9 3 1 2 = 1.93 (i 0.01; Chi ² + 2.10 (i 4 applicable i = 0.01; Chi ² + 2.10 (i 5 applicable i = 0.10; Chi ² + 2.10 (i 5 applicable i = 0.10; Chi ²	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 [≠] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [×] = 2.11 P = 0.0 Not app SD T 5.92 0 0 NG SD T 5.92 0 0 0 0 0 0 NG SD T 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	25 25 100001 159 46, df (5) 3.23, 3.23, 74 30 24 30 24 30 74 9, df = 14) 33 33 107 74 9, df = 14) 20 24 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 30 74 30 30 74 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30 30	6 6 6 6 6 7 6 7 6 7 7 7 6 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7 7	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1.148	25 25 0001); l ² 000001). <u>Total</u> 200 24 30 74 30 74 33 33 33 107 (l ² = 9% <u>33</u> 33 33 107 (l ² = 9% <u>74</u> 30 20 0 27 24 30 0101	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% P = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 33.1% 33.1% 33.7% 46 100.0% 6 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.30] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.52, 0.52] -2.39 [-3.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.52, 0.52] -3.39 [-3.10, -1.50] -0.39 [-1.39, 0.51]	+10 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI CI	10
kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.1.2 Post Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.1.2 Post Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for subaroup diff Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Study or Subgroup 12.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.1.2 Post Study or Subgroup 12.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.1.2 Post Study or Subgroup 12.1.1 TMA	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.96 (0.9 (0.9))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))))	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 ² = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable ² = 2.11 P = 0.0 Not app SD T 5.92 0.3 0.8 1.48 P = 0.0 0 NG app P = 0.0 NG app P = 0.0 NG app P = 0.0 Not app SD T 5.92 0.3 0.8 1.48 P = 0.0 0 NG app P = 0.0 NG app P = 0.0 NO app P	25 25 159 46, df (5) 3.23, 20 24 30 24 30 74 9, df 4) 33 33 33 107 7, 4) 9, df 4) 107 20 24 30 0 24 30 0 24 30 0 24 30 20 24 30 0 24 30 0 24 30 30 24 30 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33	6 6 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 2 (P = Mean 2 6 1,7 4 f = 3 (P - 4 1 1 1 4 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.000	25 25 0001); I ² 00001), <u>Total</u> 20 24 30 24 30 74 I ² 9% 33 33 107 I ² 9% 20 27 24 30 20 27 24 30 011	16.3% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, -0.37] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Randoff, -0.58 (-0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] 0.01 [-0.62, 0.62] -0.39 [-1.0, -1.60] 0.01 [-0.46, 0.67] -1.33 [-1.09, 0.21] -0.39 [-1.90, 0.21]	+10 Favours PENG Favours PICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI Favours PICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI The state of the st	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect. Total (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* = Test for overall effect. Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vanshi 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* Test for overall effect. Total (95% CI) at Statoroverall effect. Total (95% CI) at Statoroverall effect. Total (95% CI) at 2.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Chol 2022 Vanshi 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) at 2.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Chol 2022 Hua 2022 Vanshi 2023 Subtotal (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau* Test for overall effect.	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 0.9 $\frac{1}{2}$ Mean 2.5 $\frac{6}{2}$ 0.9 $\frac{3}{3}$ 1 2.5 $\frac{6}{2}$ 0.9 $\frac{3}{3}$ 1 2.5 $\frac{6}{2}$ 0.9 $\frac{3}{3}$ 1 2.5 $\frac{6}{2}$ 0.9 $\frac{3}{3}$ 1 2.5 $\frac{6}{2}$ 0.9 $\frac{1}{2}$ 2.5 $\frac{6}{2}$ 2.5 $\frac{6}{2$	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 a ² = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable ² = 2.15 P = 0.0 Not app SD T 5.92 0.3 0.8 1.48 ² = 39.1 P = 0.1	25 25 100001 159 16, df 55 3.23. cotal 20 24 30 74 9, df 14) 9, df 14) 9, df 107 9, df 14) 107 20 27 24 33 33	6 6 1) 1 1 4 1 2 1 4 2 2 6 1.7 4 1 1 2 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.00 0.33); 4.44 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.4 0.	25 25 00001); I ² 000001), Total 20 24 30 74 (I ² = 9%) 33 33 33 107 (I ² = 9%) 107 24 30 20 27 24 30 107; I ² = 9%) 107 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 21 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 21 20 20 20 21 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20	16.3% 100.0% = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 100.0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.25] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.2, 0.82] -0.39 [-1.0, -1.80] 0.11 [-0.46] .037 -1.33 [-1.80, -0.77] -0.89 [-1.99, 0.21]	Tavours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overal effect: Test for overal effect: Test for subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau's test for subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau's Heterogeneity: Tau's Heterogeneity: Tau's Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau's Subtola (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (i 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (i 0.9 3 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.92 0.9 3 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.92 0.9 3 1.14; Chi ² 2.5 5 0.9 3 1.14; Chi ² 2.5 5 0.0 1; Chi ² 1.14; Chi ² 2.5 5 1.14; Chi ² 2.5 5 1.15; Chi ² 2.5 5	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG SD T 0 0 0 cable = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable = 2.15 P = 0.0 Not appr SD T 5.92 0.3 1.48 = 39.0 0.8 1.48 = 39.0 0 1.48 = 39.0 1.48 = 39.0 1.48	25 25 100001 159 16, df 55 3.23. 20 24 30 74 9, df 14) 33 33 33 107 9, df 14) 107 20 27 24 30 33 33	6)) = 5 (P < df = 2 (l Mean 3 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 2 6 1.7 4 f = 3 (P	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.1 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.11 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.00 0.33); 1.11	25 25 0001); l ² 700001), 700001), 700001, 74 300 74 300 74 33 33 33 107 [l ² = 9% 107 [l ² = 9% 200 27 24 20 20 27 24 10001 10001); l ²	16.3% 16.3% = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 33.7% 100.0% 6	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference IV, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.62, 0.63] -2.39 [-3.10, -180] 0.01 [-0.46, 0.67] -3.39 [-1.59, 0.21]	+10 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect test for subarous different at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.11M Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for subarous diff 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Test for overall effect	2 1 ppicable Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.00 (Mean 2.55 (0.9 (0	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 SD T SD T SD T P = 0.0 0 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 1.48 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 1.48 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 1.48 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 1.48 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0.148 a = 2.15 P = 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 1.48 P = 0.1 1.11	25 25 100001 159 66, df (55) 3.2.3, 20 24 30 24 30 74 9, df = 14) 107 9, df = 14) 20 24 33 33 33 107 20 24 30 33 33 20 24 30 20 24 30 20 24 30 33 33 33 20 24 30 33 33 33 20 24 30 24 30 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33	6 1) = 5 (P -4 df = 2 (l Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 2 6 1.7 4 1 1 4 = 1 (P - 4 3 1 4 4 = 2 (P - 2 3 1 4 4 = 2 (l - 2 4 - 2 (l - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2 - 2	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB 50 1.11 0.33); FICB 50 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.000 0.74	25 25 0001); I ² 00001); Total 20 24 30 74 33 33 33 107 (I [*] = 9% 107 (I [*] = 9% 20 27 24 20 27 24 20 27 24 33 33 33	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% 1 ² = 93% 1 ² = 91.4' Weight 100.0% 5 100.0% 5 100.0% 5	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.30] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Randoff, -0.58 -0.39 [-3.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference 1.00 [-0.52, 0.52] -0.39 [-1.99, 0.21] -0.31 [-1.99, 0.21] -0.53 [-1.59, 0.21] -0.53 [-1.59, 0.21]	to the second se	10
Long 2022 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vanshi 2023 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overall effect Test for suborou diff at 2.1 Hua Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overall effect Test for suborou diff at 2.1.4 (hor moveme Study or Subgroup Latin Tau* Test for overall effect 12.1.1 PMA Aliste 2021 Choi 2022 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau*= Test for overall effect 12.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (9% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 Mean 2.55 (2) 0.93 1 2.55 (2) 0.95 (1.48 P < 0.0 P = 0.0 P = 0.0 P = 0.0 P = 0.0 P = 0.0 P = 0.0 0.4 1.48 P = 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	25 25 100001 159 66, df (55) 3.23, 20 24 30 20 24 30 74 9, df = 14) 9, df = 14) 107 9, df = 14) 107 20 27 24 30 33 33 101 101 101 9, df (10) 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	6)) = 5 (P - df = 2 (l Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 4 = 3 = 1 (P - 1 (P -	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 0.33); 1.11 0.33); 0.35); 0.35]; 0.	25 25 001); ² 00001). Total 20 24 30 33 33 33 107 [² = 9% 107 24 30 27 24 30 20 27 24 30 30 31 33 33	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% P = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 20.2% 33.1% 33.7% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 16.8% 16.8% 16.8% 16.8% 16.8%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.37] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.00 [-0.62, 063] -1.33 [-10, 0.717] -0.89 [-1.99, 0.21] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56]	+10 Favours PENG Favours PENG Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI Favours PENO Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI Favours FICB	10
kong 2022 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect: Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect: Test for subaroup diffe at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1. THM Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect Test for subarou diff Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect Test for subarou diff Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect Test for subarou diff Aliste 2021 Choi 2022 Vanneil 2023 Vanneil 2023 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect Test for subarou diff Aliste 2021 Choi 2022 Vanneil 2023 Vanneil 2023 Vanneil 2023 Vanneil 2023 Vanneil 2023 Subtola (95% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect Test for subarou diff Heterogeneity: Tau? Test for overall effect Test for subarou diff Heterogeneity: Tau? Heterogeneity: Tau? Heterogeneity: Tau? Heterogeneity: Tau? Heterogeneity: Tau?	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 2.5 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.10 (1 2.5 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.14; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (1 4 bplicable (1) Chi ² Z = 2.10 (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1) (1)	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 $P = 0.0SD TSD T5.920.41.48P = 0.000cabler = 2.15P = 0.00cabler = 2.15P = 0.00r = 2.15P = 0.00r = 2.15P = 0.00r = 3.0SD TSD T$	25 25 100001 159 166, df 159 3.23, 20 24 30 24 30 74 9, df 33 33 107 74 9, df 107 107 101 20 27 44 30 001 101 103, df 103, df	6 6 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 2 6 1,7 4 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 4 = 2 (P = 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 4 = 2	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.43 1.48 0.333; 1.11 0.333; FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.000 0.74	25 25 00001); I ² 00001). <u>Total</u> 200 24 30 74 74 74 33 33 33 107 (I [*] = 9%) <u>107</u> 20 27 27 40 30 101 10001); I ²	16.3% 100.0% = 93% P = 91.4' 28.2% 33.1% 33.1% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%\\ 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.32] -0.67 [-119, 0.15] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.2, 0.63] -1.32 [-100, -0.71] -0.89 [-1.99, 0.21] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56]	Tavours PENG Favours PENG N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours PENG Favours PENG Favours PENG Favours PENG Favours FICB	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overal effect Test for overal effect test for subarous diffect at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.11M Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tay = 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tay = Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for subarous diffect Test for subarous diffect Test for overal effect Test for subarous diffect Test for subarous diffect Test for overal effect Test for overal effect	2 1 pplicable Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (Mean 2.55 (0.01; Chi ² 4 2.5 (0.01; Chi ² 4 2.5 (0.01; Chi ² 4 pplicable 8 0.01; Chi ² 1.8 (2) 1.8 (2) 1.2 = 2.10 (2.2 = 2.10 (1.2 =	1.48 P < 0.0 P = 67.3 P = 0.0 hl ² = 25 SD T 5.92 0.4 1.48 P = 0.0 0 cable [#] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [#] = 2.19 P = 0.0 Not app SD T 5.92 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.4 P = 0.1 1.48 P = 0.0 NG P = 0.0 P = 0.0 NG P =	25 25 100001 159 16, df 15) 3.23, 20 24 30 24 30 74 9, df 14) 20 27 43 33 33 107 74 9, df 14) 20 24 30 74 20 24 30 74 10 74 33 33 33 107 107 109 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100 100	6 1) = 5 (P - 4 df = 2 (l <u>Mean</u> 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 2 6 1.7 4 f = 3 (P - 2 6 1.7 4 f = 3 (P - 2 6 1.7 4 5 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2 2	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.1 FICB SD 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.000 0.74	25 25 0001); P 00001). Total 200 24 33 33 33 107 (P = 9%) 107 (P = 9%) 20 27 24 40 30 74 74 74 74 70 74 74 70 70 72 74 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107 107	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% 1 ² = 93% 1 ² = 91.4' Weight 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10.6% 16.6% 16.8% 16.8% 16.8%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.07 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Randoff, -0.02 0.00 [-0.62, 0.62] -2.39 [-3.0, -1.68] 0.01 [-0.64, 0.65] -1.33 [-1.09, -0.71] -0.39 [-1.39, 0.21] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56]	+10 Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N, Random, 95% CI +10 +10 +10 +10 +10 +10 +10 +10	10
kong 2022 Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.1.2 Post Subtotal (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for suborou diff diff (9% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Test for overall effect	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (0.9 (1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 $hi^2 = 23$ SD T 5.92 0 r = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 r = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 r = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 r = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 r = 2.15 P = 0.0 1.48 r = 39.1 P = 0.1 1.11 P < 0.0 1.85	25 25 159 16, df 159 3.23. 20 24 30 74 9, df= 14) 33 33 33 107 9, df= 14) 01ical 101 03, df 101 03, df 101 103 33 30 20 74 9, df= 14) 20 24 20 24 30 33 33 33 20 74 9, df= 14) 20 74 30 33 33 33 20 74 9, df= 14) 20 74 30 33 33 33 20 74 9, df= 14) 20 74 30 33 33 30 20 74 9, df= 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	6 6 1) 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 < 0.000 0.74 2.22	25 25 159 0001); ² 700001), 10001), ⁷ ⁷ = 9% 33 33 33 33 107 (⁷ = 9% 107 24 30 20 27 24 30 101 10001); ²	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% 100.0% 12 = 93% 12 = 91.4' 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.30] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Randoff, 0.630, -0.33 -0.39 [-1.0, -1.60] 0.00 [-0.62, 0.62] -0.39 [-1.0, -1.60] 0.01 [-0.46, 0.67] -1.33 [-0.63, 1.56] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38]	The second secon	10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Hua 2022 Vanshi 2023 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = test for suberoup Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 12.1.1 TMA Aliste 2021 Chol 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 12.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 12.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for overall effect 12.1.3 PNA Kong 2022 Subtotal (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 2.5 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.25 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.9 \pm 1.14; Chi ² Z = 1.92 (1 4 bplicable 0.01; Chi ² 2.5 \pm 0.9 \pm 0.01; Chi ² 4 bplicable 0.01; Chi ² 2.5 \pm 0.01; Chi ² 0.01; Chi ² 0	1.48 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 NG <u>SD T</u> 5.92 0.4 1.48 [≈] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [≈] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [≈] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable [≈] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 1.48 [≈] = 2.15 P = 0.0 0.3 1.48 [≈] = 3.9.0 1.111 P < 0.0 1.85	25 25 159 16, df 159 3.23. 20 24 30 74 9, df 14) 33 33 107 9, df 14) 20 74 9, df 14) 20 74 9, df 101 101 101 27 24 30 33 33 00011) 25 25	6 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 4 = 2 (P = 3 4 4 = 2 (P = 3 4 4 = 2 (I = 2 (I = 1)) 4 = 2	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 0.33); 1.11 0.33); 0.5 1.48 < 0.000 0.74 2.222	25 25 159 0001); P 20 24 30 74 33 33 33 107 (P=9%) 107 (P=9%) 107 20 20 27 20 20 20 27 20 33 33 33 33 25 25	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 33.1% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 16.6% 66.4% 16.8% 16.8% 16.8% 16.9%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference <i>N</i> , Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference <i>V</i> , Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.2, 0.53] -0.39 [-1.0, -1.80, -0.71] -0.39 [-1.0, -1.80, -0.71] -0.39 [-1.90, 0.21] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38]	Tavours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI CI	10
Kong 2022 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for overal effect Test for subaroup diffe at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1. THA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau's Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Nal 21.1. THA Aliste 2021 Choi 2022 Vamshi 2023 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Nal 24.1.3. PFNA Kong 2022 Subtola (95% C) Heterogeneity: Nal 24.1.3. PFNA	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (Mean 2.5 5 (0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (4 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (4 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.10 (4 0.01; Chi ² Z = 2.2 2.1 (1.8 2 1.8 2 1.9 (0.1 2 1.8 2 1.9 (0.1 2 1.9 (1.9 (1.9 (1.9 (1.9 (1.9 (1.9 (1.9 (1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 NG SD T 5.92 0.4 0 cable = 2.16(P = 0.0 0 cable = 2.16(SD T F = 0.0 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.3 0.48 = 39.1 (1.48 = 2.35) P = 0.0 1.48 = 2.15(P = 0.0 1.48 = 2.92(P = 0.0 1.85 = 2.92(P = 0.0 1.85 = 2.92(P = 0.0 1.85 = 2.92(P = 0.0 1.85 = 2.92(P = 0.0 1.85(P = 0.0 1.85(25 25 159 16, df 159 3.23, 3.23, 70 74 30 74 30 74 33 33 33 33 33 107 79, df 14) 107 20 27 24 30 20 27 24 30 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 107 20 20 27 20 20 24 24 30 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33	6 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 = 3 = 2 (P = 3 =	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.333); 1.11 0.333); FICB SD 0.5 1 1.48 3.7 0.5 1 1.48 0.000 0.74 2.222	25 25 159 0001); i ² 700001), 20 24 33 33 33 107 (i ² = 9% 107 (i ² = 9% 20 20 20 27 24 33 33 33 25 25	16.3% 100.0% = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 33.1% 100.0% 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference //, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.37] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference //, Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.53, 1.0-18] -0.39 [-1.99, 0.21] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38]		10
Kong 2022 Subtotal (9% CI) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect test for subarous diffect at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1.11MA Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 16.1.2 Positioning Jadon 2021 Subtotal (9% CI) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Test for subarous diffect test for subarous diffect test for overall effect Test for overall effect	2 1 pplicable Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9 0.9	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 hi ² = 23 S.0 T 5.92 0.4 1.48 * = 2.15 0 0 cable * = 2.15 0 cable * = 2.15 S.0 T 0 cable * = 2.15 S.0 T 5.92 0 0 cable * = 2.9 S.0 T * = 30,0 P = 0.0 1.48 P = 0.0 Not app * = 30,0 P = 0.1 1.48 P = 0.0 Not app * = 30,0 P = 0.0 1.48 P = 0.0 0 S.0 T S.0 T S.0 T S.0 T S.92 0.3 0.8 1.48 P = 0.0 1.48 P = 0.0 Not app * = 30,0 P = 0.0 1.48 P = 0.0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	25 25 159 16, df 159 3.23, 30 74 30 74 30 74 30 74 40 107 79, df 140 20 27 44 30 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33 33	6 Mean 3 4 4 2 (P = 3 2 (P = 3 4 4 5 5	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.333); 1.11 0.333); FICB SD 3.7 0.55 1 1.48 < 0.000 0.74 2.222	25 25 159 0001); P 00001). Total 20 24 30 33 33 107 (P = 9%) 107 27 4 30 20 27 24 30 33 33 25 25	16.3% 16.3% 100.0% 12 = 93% 12 = 91.4' Weight 12 2.2% 100.0% 100.0% 100.0% 10.	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.9 (-0.11, -0.15) -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.39 [-1.19, -0.15] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] 1.05 [0.53, 1.50] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.58 [-1.55, -0.38]	to the second se	10
Long 2022 Subtotal (95% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup Test for suborou diff at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Total (95% C) Heterogeneity, Nat a Test for overall effect Total (95% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 Mean 2.55 (2) 0.9 (1) Mean 2.55 (2) 0.9 (1) 4 0.9 (1) 2.5 (2) 0.9 (1) 4 bplicable 0.9 (1) 2.5 (2) 0.9 (1) 4 bplicable 2.5 (2) 1.14; Chi ² 2.5 (2) 1.14; Chi ² 2.	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 NG S2D T 5.92 0.4 ² = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable ² = 2.15 P = 0.0 Not app P = 0.0 P =	25 25 159 16, df 159 16, df 159 20 24 30 74 9, df 20 24 30 74 9, df 14) 107 9, df 20 24 30 74 9, df 14) 107 9, df 20 20 24 30 33 33 107 107 101 101 101 101 101 101	6 Mean 1 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3 = 2 (P = 3 2 6 1.7 4 1 4 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 5 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 1.11 0.33); 1.11 0.33); FICB SD 0.5 1.48 < 0.000 0.74 2.22 < 0.000	25 25 159 0001); P 20 24 30 74 74 30 33 33 107 74 20 24 30 33 33 33 107 (P=9%) 27 24 30 33 33 33 107 25 25 25 159 9001); P	16.3% 16.3% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.25 [-0.81, 0.32] Not estimable Not estimable -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M, Random, 95% CI -0.00 [-0.2, 0.63] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.58 [-1.53, 0.38]	The second secon	10
kong 2022 Subtotal (5% C) Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for overall effect Test for subaroup diffe at 12 h (on moveme Study or Subgroup 16.1 THM Aliste 2021 Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Subtotal (5% C) Heterogeneity: Tau ² = Subtotal (5% C)	2 1 plicable Z = 5.85 (1 1.14; Chi ² Z = 5.85 (1 0.9 $\frac{1}{2}$ 2.5 $\frac{1}{2}$ 0.9 $\frac{1}{2}$ 2.5 $\frac{1}{$	1.48 P < 0.0 = 67.3 P = 0.0 NG SD T = 5.92 0.4 1.48 = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 cable = 2.15 P = 0.0 0 SD T = 3.03 0.3 0.8 1.48 P = 0.0 NG P = 0.0 0 NG P = 0.0 0 P = 0.0 0 NG T P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 0 P = 0.0 0 P = 0.0 P = 0	25 25 159 16, df 159 20 24 3.23. 20 24 3.23. 20 74 9, df 107 9, df 107 9, df 107 24 33 33 33 0001) 101 33 33 0001) 101 102 25 25 001) 159 33 23 24 33 33 33 33 33 20 74 107 107 101 101 101 101 101 101 101 101	6 Mean 3 1 4 = 2 (P = 3) 2 (P = 3) 2 (P = 3) 1 (P = 3) 4 4 f = 3 (P = 2) 5 5 f = 5 (P < 3) 5	2.22 < 0.000 P < 0.0 FICB SD 4.44 0.4 1.48 0.333; 1.11 0.333; 1.11 0.333; 1.11 0.333; 2.22 < 0.000 0.74 2.222 < 0.000 0.74	25 25 159 00001); l ² 20 24 33 33 33 107 1 ^P = 9% <u>74</u> 43 33 33 107 1 ^P = 9% <u>74</u> 43 33 33 20 27 24 20 27 24 20 33 33 25 25 55 90001); l ² l ²	16.3% 100.0% = 93% P = 91.4' Weight 28.2% 33.1% 100.0% Weight 100.0% (16.6% 6.4% 16.8% 66.4% 16.9% 16.9% 100.0%	-2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -2.09 [-2.79, -1.39] -0.88 [-1.77, 0.01] % Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI -0.09 [-0.71, 0.53] -0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Not estimable Not estimable 0.37 [-0.71, -0.02] Std. Mean Difference M. Random, 95% CI 0.00 [-0.2, 0.25] -1.33 [-100, -0.71] -0.39 [-1.39, 0.21] 1.05 [0.53, 1.56] -0.96 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.58 [-1.55, -0.38] -0.58 [-1.55, -0.38]	Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB Std. Mean Difference N. Random, 95% CI Favours PENG Favours FICB	

Supplementary Figure 6: Forest plot for the pain score during movement within 30 min, at 6 h, 12 h and 24 h in different types of surgeries

	P	ENG			FICB			Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Study or Subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% CI	IV, Random, 95% CI
7.1.1 DHS									
Mosaffa 2021	4.7	3.1	30	2.58	2	22	24.9%	2.12 [0.73, 3.51]	
Natrajan 2022 Subtotal (95% CI)	8.2	3.1	12 42	4	1.5	12 34	23.5% 48.4%	4.20 [2.25, 6.15] 3.04 [1.02, 5.07]	-
Heterogeneity: Tau ² : Test for overall effect	= 1.42; C t: Z = 2.94	hi² = I (P =	2.90, d 0.003)	f=1(P:	= 0.09)); I² = 6I	6%		
7.1.2 Positioning									
Jadon 2021	11.21	0.7	33	11.8	0.84	33	26.3%	-0.59 [-0.96, -0.22]	•
Shankar 2020 Subtotal (95% CI)	8.2	3.1	30 63	4	1.5	30 63	25.2% 51.6%	4.20 [2.97, 5.43] 1.77 [-2.93, 6.46]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect	= 11.26; t Z = 0.74	Chi²= I (P =	= 53.17 : 0.46)	, df = 1 ((P < 0.	00001)	; I² = 98%		
Total (95% CI)			105			97	100.0%	2.42 [-0.42, 5.26]	
Heterogeneity: Tau ² Test for overall effect Test for subgroup di	= 7.94; C t Z = 1.67 fferences	hi ² = ? (P = :: Chi	80.79, 0.10) ² = 0.24	df=3 (F 1,df=1	< 0.0	0001); .62), I ^z :	² = 96% = 0%		-10 -5 0 5 1 Favours PENG Favours FICB

Supplementary Figure 7: Forest plot for time to first rescue analgesia in different types of surgeries



Supplementary Figure 8: Forest plot for oral morphine equivalent consumption 24 h postoperatively in different types of surgeries