



From: [BMC Anesthesiol. 2012; 12: 32.](#)

Published online 2012 December 14. doi: 10.1186/1471-2253-12-32

[Copyright/License](#) ▶

[Request permission to reuse](#)

Table 4

Levels of evidence

1++	RCTs with a very low risk of bias (or high quality meta-analyses, systemic reviews of RCTs)
1+	RCTs with a low risk of bias (or well conducted meta-analyses, systematic reviews of RCTs)
1-	RCTs with a high risk of bias (or meta-analyses, systematic reviews or RCTs)
2++	High quality case-control or cohort studies with a very low risk of confounding/bias/chance and a high probability that the relationship is causal (or High quality systematic reviews of case-control or cohort studies)
2+	Well conducted case-control or cohort studies with a low risk of confounding/bias/chance and a moderate probability that the relationship is causal
2-	Case-control or cohort studies with a high risk of confounding/bias/chance and a significant risk that the relationship is not causal
3	Non-analytic studies, eg. Case reports, case series
4	Expert opinion

Reproduced from Harbour R, Miller J. A new system for grading recommendations in evidence based guidelines. *BMJ (Clinical research ed)* 2001;323:334-6) with permission from BMJ Publishing Group Ltd. RCTs, Randomized controlled trials.