

Table 1: Results from risk of bias assessment in the prospective non-randomized study using the Newcastle-Ottawa score.

	Category	Criteria	Points
Wang et al.	Selection (max 4 points)	Representativeness of the exposed cohort	*
		Selection of the non-exposed cohort	*
		Ascertainment of exposure	*
		Demonstration that outcome of interest was not present at start of study	*
	Comparability (max 2 points)	Comparability of cohorts on the basis of the design or analysis	**
	Outcome (max 3 points)	Assessment of outcome	*
		Was follow-up long enough for outcomes to occur	*
		Adequacy of follow up of cohorts	*
	Total score		9/9 (Low bias)

* Indicates a single point.

Table 2: Results from risk of bias assessment in RCT using the Cochrane RoB tool.

	Domain* 1	Domain 2	Domain 3	Domain 4	Domain 5	Overall assessment
Kvarnström et al.	-	-	+	+	+	+
Tiberio et al.	+	-	+	+	+	+

Judgement: + Low, x High risk, - medium risk

*Explanation of domains: Domain 1: Bias arising for the randomization process; Domain 2: Bias due to deviations from the intended intervention; Domain 3: Bias due to missing outcome data; Domain 4: Bias in measurement of the outcome; Domain 5: Bias in selection of the reported results

References:

1. Ivascu R, Torsin LI, Hostiuc L, Nitipir C, Corneci D, Dutu M. The Surgical Stress Response and Anesthesia: A Narrative Review. J Clin Med. 2024;13(10).
2. Cusack B, Buggy DJ. Anaesthesia, analgesia, and the surgical stress response. BJA Educ. 2020;20(9):321-8.
3. Huiku M, Uutela K, van Gils M, Korhonen I, Kymäläinen M, Meriläinen P, et al. Assessment of surgical stress during general anaesthesia. Br J Anaesth. 2007;98(4):447-55.
4. Hirose M, Okutani H, Hashimoto K, Ueki R, Shimode N, Kariya N, et al. Intraoperative Assessment of Surgical Stress Response Using Nociception Monitor under General Anesthesia and Postoperative Complications: A Narrative Review. J Clin Med. 2022;11(20).
5. Li G, Lin L, Xiao J, Rosenbaum S, Bickler P, Meng L. Intraoperative physiological ranges associated with improved outcomes after major spine surgery: an observational study. BMJ Open. 2019;9(5):e025337.
6. Dindo D, Demartines N, Clavien PA. Classification of surgical complications: a new proposal with evaluation in a cohort of 6336 patients and results of a survey. Ann Surg. 2004;240(2):205-13.

7. Pratiaksa A. Advancements in anesthesia monitoring for enhanced patient safety. *Anaesthesiology and Clinical Science Research*. 2024;8(4):193.
8. Wang SZ, Chen Y, Lin HY, Chen LW. Comparison of surgical stress response to laparoscopic and open radical cystectomy. *World J Urol*. 2010;28(4):451-5.
9. Kvarnström A, Swartling T, Kurlberg G, Bengtson JP, Bengtsson A. Pro-inflammatory cytokine release in rectal surgery: comparison between laparoscopic and open surgical techniques. *Arch Immunol Ther Exp (Warsz)*. 2013;61(5):407-11.
10. Tiberio GA, Baiocchi GL, Arru L, Agabiti Rosei C, De Ponti S, Matheis A, et al. Prospective randomized comparison of laparoscopic versus open adrenalectomy for sporadic pheochromocytoma. *Surg Endosc*. 2008;22(6):1435-9.
11. Ivascu R, Dutu M, Corneci D, Nitipir C. Energy Expenditure, a New Tool for Monitoring Surgical Stress in Colorectal Oncological Patients: A Prospective, Monocentric Study. *Cureus*. 2024;16(3):e56822.
12. Nguyen NT, Goldman CD, Ho HS, Gosselin RC, Singh A, Wolfe BM. Systemic stress response after laparoscopic and open gastric bypass. *J Am Coll Surg*. 2002;194(5):557-66; discussion 66-7.
13. Veenhof AA, Sietses C, von Blomberg BM, van Hoogstraten IM, vd Pas MH, Meijerink WJ, et al. The surgical stress response and postoperative immune function after laparoscopic or conventional total mesorectal excision in rectal cancer: a randomized trial. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2011;26(1):53-9.
14. El-Hussuna A, Hussain MI, Cuk P, Ellebæk MB. A systematic review on biomarkers implemented to measure surgical stress response in patients undergoing colorectal surgery. *Int J Colorectal Dis*. 2025;40(1):168.