Methods of milk expression for lactating women (Review)

Becker GE, Smith HA, Cooney F



THE COCHRANE COLLABORATION®

This is a reprint of a Cochrane review, prepared and maintained by The Cochrane Collaboration and published in *The Cochrane Library* 2015, Issue 2

http://www.thecochranelibrary.com

WILEY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HEADER . . . 1
ABSTRACT . . . 1
PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY . . . 2
BACKGROUND . . . 3
OBJECTIVES . . . 4
METHODS . . . 4
RESULTS . . . 8
Figure 1. . . . 11
Figure 2. . . . 12
DISCUSSION . . . 18
AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS . . . 21
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . 22
REFERENCES . . . 22
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES . . . 30
DATA AND ANALYSES . . . 80
Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Any type of pump versus hand expression, Outcome 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant. 86
Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1 Any type of pump versus hand expression, Outcome 2 Transfer to feeding at breast. . . 86
Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant. 87
Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 2 Quanity of milk expressed. . . 88
Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 3 Nutrients (potassium, energy) in milk. . . . 89
Analysis 2.4. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 4 Nutrients (sodium, protein) in milk. 90
Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Any manual pump versus any other manual pump, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed mL/24 hours. . . . 91
Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 1 Maternal satisfaction (self-efficacy). . . . 92
Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 2 Maternal satisfaction (with instructions). . . . 92
Analysis 5.3. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 3 Adverse effects for mother or infant. . . . 93
Analysis 5.4. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 4 Quantity of milk expressed. 94
Analysis 5.5. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 5 Nutrients (potassium, protein, nitrogen) in milk. . . . 95
Analysis 5.6. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 6 Nutrients (sodium, energy) in milk. . . . 96
Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed. . . . 97
Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 2 Change in 24 hour milk production (g). . . . 97
Analysis 7.3. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 3 Time taken to express. . . . 98
Analysis 7.4. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels. . . . 98
Analysis 8.1. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant. . . . 99
Analysis 8.2. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 2 Quantity of milk expressed. . 100
Analysis 8.3. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 3 Time taken to express milk. . 101
Analysis 8.4. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 4 Nutrients (sodium, potassium, energy) in milk. . . . 102
Analysis 8.5. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 5 Nutrient (protein) in milk. . 103

Analysis 9.1. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed (one expression). 104
Analysis 9.2. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 2 Quantity of milk expressed (g/one day). 105
Analysis 9.3. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 3 Time taken to express. 106
Analysis 9.4. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels. 107
Analysis 10.1. Comparison 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed. 108
Analysis 10.2. Comparison 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping, Outcome 2 Time taken to express milk. 109
Analysis 10.3. Comparison 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping, Outcome 3 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels. 109
Analysis 11.1. Comparison 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique, Outcome 1 Quanity of milk expressed. 110
Analysis 11.2. Comparison 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique, Outcome 2 Nutrients in milk (fat g/L) per day. 111
Analysis 11.3. Comparison 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique, Outcome 3 Nutrients in milk Creamatocrit % (one sample). 112
Analysis 12.1. Comparison 12 Any method plus specific instruction provided versus any method with no specific instruction provided, Outcome 1 Transfer to feeding at breast. 112
Analysis 13.1. Comparison 13 Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed (mL from two expressions. 113
Analysis 13.2. Comparison 13 Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage, Outcome 2 Nutrients in milk. 113
Analysis 14.1. Comparison 14 Any method plus warming the breast versus not warming the breast, Outcome 1 Quanity of milk expressed (mL). 114
ADDITIONAL TABLES 115
APPENDICES 126
WHAT'S NEW 127
HISTORY 127
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS 128
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST 128
SOURCES OF SUPPORT 128
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW 129

[Intervention Review]

Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Genevieve E Becker[1,2], Hazel A Smith[3], Fionnuala Cooney[4]

[1]Unit for Health Services Research and International Health, WHO Collaborating Centre for Maternal and Child Health, Institute for Maternal and Child Health, IRCCS Burlo Garofolo, Trieste, Italy. [2]BEST Services, Galway, Ireland. [3]Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, UCC (University College Cork), Cork, Ireland. [4]Department of Public Health, HSE East, Dublin, Ireland

Contact address: Genevieve E Becker, Unit for Health Services Research and International Health, WHO Collaborating Centre for Maternal and Child Health, Institute for Maternal and Child Health, IRCCS Burlo Garofolo, Via dell'Istria 65/1, Trieste, 34137, Italy. gbecker@bestservices.ie.

Editorial group: Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.
Publication status and date: New search for studies and content updated (no change to conclusions), published in Issue 2, 2015.
Review content assessed as up-to-date: 21 March 2014.

Citation: Becker GE, Smith HA, Cooney F. Methods of milk expression for lactating women. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015, Issue 2. Art. No.: CD006170. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006170.pub4.

ABSTRACT

Background

This is an update of a 2008 Cochrane review. Breastfeeding is important. However, not all infants can feed at the breast and methods of expressing milk need evaluation.

Objectives

To assess acceptability, effectiveness, safety, effect on milk composition, contamination and cost implications of methods of milk expression.

Search methods

We searched the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group's Trials Register (March 2014), CINAHL (1982 to March 2014), conference proceedings, secondary references and contacted researchers.

Selection criteria

Randomised and quasi-randomised trials comparing methods at any time after birth.

Data collection and analysis

Three authors independently assessed trials, extracted data and assessed risk of bias.

Main results

This updated review includes 34 studies involving 1998 participants, with 17 trials involving 961 participants providing data for analysis. Eight studies compared one or more types of pump versus hand expression and 14 studies compared one type of pump versus another type of pump, with three of these studies comparing both hand expression and multiple pump types. Fifteen studies compared a specific protocol or adjunct behaviour including sequential versus simultaneous pumping protocols (five studies), pumping $\geq$ 4 times per day versus $\leq$ 3 times per day (one study), provision of a milk expression education and support intervention to mothers of preterm infants versus no provision (one study), provision of audio/visual relaxation to mothers of preterm infants versus no specific relaxation (two studies), commencing pumping within one hour of delivery versus between one to six hours (one study), breast massage before or during pumping versus no massage (two studies, of which one also tested a second behaviour), therapeutic touch versus none (one

study), warming breasts before pumping versus not warming breasts (one study), combining hand expression with pumping versus pumping alone (one study) and a breast cleansing protocol versus no protocol (one study).

There were insufficient comparable data on outcomes to undertake meta-analysis and data reported relates to evidence from single studies.

Only one of the 17 studies examining maternal satisfaction/acceptability provided data in a way that could be analysed, reporting that mothers assigned to the pumping group had more agreement with the statement 'I don't want anyone to see me pumping' than mothers in the hand expression group and the statement 'I don't want anyone to see me hand expressing' (n = 68, mean difference (MD) -0.70, 95% confidence interval (CI) -1.25 to -0.15, P = 0.01), and that mothers found instructions for hand expression were clearer than for pumping (n = 68, MD 0.40, 95% CI 0.05 to 0.75, P = 0.02). No evidence of a difference was found between methods related to adverse effects of milk contamination (one study, n = 28, risk ratio (RR) 0.89, 95% CI 0.62 to 1.27, P = 0.51), (one study, n = 142 milk samples, MD 0.20, 95% CI -0.18 to 0.58, P = 0.30), (one study, n = 123 milk samples, MD 0.10, 95% CI -0.29 to 0.49, P = 0.61), (one study, n = 141 milk samples, MD -0.10, 95% CI -0.46 to 0.26, P = 0.59); or level of maternal breast or nipple pain or damage (one study, n = 68, MD 0.02, 95% CI -0.67 to 0.71, P = 0.96).

For the secondary outcomes, greater volume was obtained when mothers with infants in a neonatal unit were provided with a relaxation tape or music-listening interventions to use while pumping, when the breasts was warmed before pumping or massaged while pumping.

Initiation of milk pumping within 60 minutes of birth of a very low birthweight infant obtained higher mean milk quantity in the first week than the group who initiated pumping later. No evidence of difference in volume was found with simultaneous or sequential pumping or between pumps studied. Differences between methods was found for sodium, potassium, protein and fat constituents; no evidence of difference was found for energy content.

No consistent effect was found related to prolactin change or effect on oxytocin release with pump type or method. Economic aspects were not reported.

Most studies were classified as unclear or low risk of bias. Most studies did not provide any information regarding blinding of outcome assessment. Fifteen of the 25 studies that evaluated pumps or products had support from the manufacturers.

Authors' conclusions

The most suitable method for milk expression may depend on the time since birth, purpose of expression and the individual mother and infant. Low-cost interventions including early initiation when not feeding at the breast, listening to relaxation music, massage and warming of the breasts, hand expression and lower cost pumps may be as effective, or more effective, than large electric pumps for some outcomes. Small sample sizes, large standard deviations, and the diversity of the interventions argue caution in applying these results beyond the specific method tested in the specific settings.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Babies who do not receive human milk are more likely to suffer health problems both as newborns and later in life. Not all babies are able to feed at the breast because they are premature, ill or separated from their mothers and so expressed milk is needed. Mothers may also want to express milk for their own comfort or to increase supply. This updated review includes 34 randomised controlled studies involving 1998 participants, with 17 trials involving 961 participants providing data for analysis. Studies included the mothers of infants in neonatal units in the USA, UK, Malaysia, Brazil, Egypt, India, Mexico, Turkey, Kenya and Nigeria, as well as term infants in the USA, Australia, and UK. A greater milk volume was expressed when mothers were provided with an audio relaxation tape, warming the breast, massage of the breast and when the mothers started pumping milk sooner if the infant was unable to breastfeed. Sodium concentration was found to be higher in hand expressed milk compared with manual and electric pumps, and fat content higher with breast massage and with listening to an audio tape while pumping, which may be important for low birthweight infants. No consistent difference in milk volume was found between the pumps studied. Any milk contamination was similar for hand expressed and pumped milk, and the level of maternal breast or nipple pain was no different between methods. All studies were small and results may not apply to pumps other than those tested or in different situations. The diverse range of interventions studied limited the pooling of results. No study asked mothers if they had achieved their own goals for expressing milk. None of the studies examined costs involved with the methods and 15 of the 25 studies that evaluated pumps or products had support from the manufacturers. Not all the studies mentioned

whether basic supports were provided, particularly for mothers with hospitalised children, including access to food and fluid, a place to rest near their baby, and the availability of knowledgeable health workers. These supports could affect milk expression. The available evidence indicates that low-cost measures such as starting to express milk early for an infant unable to breastfeed, relaxation, breast massage, warming of the breasts, hand expression, and lower cost pumps may be as effective, or more effective, than large electric pumps for some outcomes.

BACKGROUND

Description of the condition

The World Health Organization (WHO) recommends that all infants should be fed exclusively on human milk from birth to six months of age and continued thereafter with appropriate complementary foods (WHO 2002). The importance of human milk is well supported (AAP 2012; Horta 2013a; Ip 2007). There is evidence that babies who do not receive human milk are more likely to suffer health problems including gastrointestinal and respiratory diseases (Blaymore 2002; Horta 2013b; Howie 1990; Quigley 2007), urinary tract infection (Marild 2004), necrotising enterocolitis (Lucas 1990; McGuire 2003; Schanler 1999), otitis media (Paradise 1994) other infectious diseases (Duijts 2010) and late-onset sepsis in preterm infants (Hylander 1998). In both affluent and poorer communities, not receiving human milk may increase infant mortality (Black 2013; Chen 2004; Victora 1987). The long-term health of children may be affected (Fewtrell 2004): increased rates of asthma (Gdalevich 2001) and diabetes (Gerstein 1994; Pettit 1997) are associated with not receiving human milk, as well as less than optimal cognitive development (Bier 2002; Kramer 2008; McCrory 2011) and increased risk of childhood obesity and markers of later cardiovascular disease (CDC 2007; Labayen 2012; Owen 2008). Human milk may act as an analgesic to infants during procedures such as drawing blood (Upadhyay 2004). The ability to express milk may improve the eventual breastfeeding of premature or ill infants (Furman 2002) and assist in sustaining breastfeeding (Schwartz 2002; Win 2006).

Not all babies are able to feed at the breast due to illness or abnormalities, prematurity, separation, and other reasons, and expressed milk is needed for these babies. Mothers may express their milk for their own comfort in situations of sore nipples (Buchko 1994; Nicholson 1985); engorgement (Meserve 1982); to increase milk supply (Chapman 2001); to provide milk if they are away from their baby (Geraghty 2012; Hills-Bonczyk 1993); for others to feed (Clemons 2010); for their own preference to express and feed by bottle (Fein 2008); in situations of adoption (Auerbach 1981) or surrogacy (Biervliet 2001); or to donate to a milk bank (Arnold 1990; COMA 1981). There is a risk of HIV transmission via human milk. Expressing and heat-treating the milk will destroy the HIV, thereby providing a nutrient source to infants and young children, particularly in resource-poor areas (Newell 2004). Research on human milk requires samples of milk, thus the ability and feasibility of milk expression is critical to this research (Ferris 1984; Hamosh 1984; Hartmann 1985; Mennella 2010b; Picciano 1984).

The Baby Friendly Hospital Initiative, a global project of WHO/UNICEF, requires that mothers be assisted to learn the skill of hand expression before discharge from maternity services (WHO/UNICEF 1989). However, there is limited research on the best way of learning this skill, or on the relative effectiveness of hand expression versus different mechanical methods of pumping milk. Reports on economic aspects have demonstrated that the increased illness associated with not breastfeeding can increase parental income loss due to absence from work (Cohen 1995) and increased healthcare costs (Bachrach 2003; Ball 1999; Bartick 2010; NICE 2006: Patel 2013).There are costs involved in providing assistance with learning to express, and costs in obtaining a pump and other equipment (Jegier 2010).

Description of the intervention

A variety of methods have been used to obtain milk (D'Amico 2004; Egnell 1956; Feher 1989; Foda 2004; Groh-Wargo 1995; Hill 1996; Hill 1999; Jones 2001; Mersmann 1994; Mitoulas 2002a; Morton 2009; Sponsel 1983; Wennergren 1985): described in Table 1. Quantity of milk and acceptability to the mother may vary among methods of expression - hand expression, manual pumps, battery, or electric pumps (Clemons 2010; Green 1982; Paul 1996; Tengku 2012). Milk volumes may be influenced by frequency of expression, breast massage, combining methods, by using a double-pump system rather than single pumping, pump vacuum pressure and pattern, and for infants and mothers separated at birth, and how soon after birth expression commences (Furman 2002; Hopkinson 1988; Jones 2001; Kent 2008; Morton 2009).There may be differences between hand expressing or mechanical pumping, or both, to initiate milk supply, and expressing or pumping, or both, when the mother already has an established milk supply. Quality of milk constituents may vary depending

on method of expression or pumping (Garza 1982; Lang 1994; Pessoto 2010; Spencer 1981). There may be adverse effects from expressing milk, including injury to the mother (Brown 2005; Clemons 2010; Qi 2014; Williams 1989), effect on milk supply (Chapman 2001; Rasmussen 2011), the risk of bacterial contamination (Asquith 1984; Blenkharn 1989; Boo 2001; D'Amico 2004; Karimi 2013; Thompson 1997), and reduced maternal self-confidence (Buckley 2009). Expressing or pumping, particularly when conducted to provide milk for infants in neonatal units, can be stressful for mothers and supports can assist (Acuña-Muga L 2014; BLISS 2008; Ryan 2013). The stress experienced by mothers while expressing, and any support they receive, can be very important factors and should be considered in any analysis of expression.

Why it is important to do this review

Reports on expression of milk have appeared for many years, though most relate to the development of commercial pumps (Egnell 1956; Fewtrell 2001b; Kent 2008; Meier 2012; Mitoulas 2002b; Zoppou 1997). Much of the published research has limited outcomes, often focused on volume expressed in the shortest possible time, and few reports include the impact on ongoing breastfeeding or if mothers achieved their goals regarding expressing or pumping. Milk is expressed for a wide variety of reasons; different methods may better suit different purposes (Table 1). Expressed milk is used by healthy mothers and babies as well as in problem situations. Rates of milk expression and pumping appear to be rising (Binns 2006; Clemons 2010; Fein 2008; Geraghty 2005; Johns 2013; Labiner-Wolfe 2008; Win 2006). There is a need for a review of the evidence about methods of expression of milk that is wider than comparisons of commercial pumps. This review addresses issues of effectiveness and acceptability of all methods of expressing human milk.

OBJECTIVES

The main objectives of this review were to assess acceptability, effectiveness, safety, effect on milk composition, bacterial contamination and cost implications of a range of methods of human milk expression including hand expression, manual, battery and electric pumps.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

All published and unpublished randomised or quasi-randomised controlled trials that compared one method or technique of milk expression or pumping with another, or others. We extended the scope of the review beyond the usual Pregnancy and Childbirth Group times to include studies more than 28 days after birth. Cross-over trials were eligible. There was no limitation of study by country of origin or language.

Types of participants

Women expressing or pumping milk for any reason by any method, who may or may not also be feeding a child at the breast. Health status of the child was not a defining criterion for inclusion or exclusion. We included both term and preterm, singleton and multiple births, as well as hospitalised and non-hospitalised mother-infant pairs.

Types of interventions

We included studies if they provided instructions (oral, written or other media) on hand expression or mechanical pumping specifically for the study, or provided hand expression or mechanical pumping equipment, or if the study required expression or pumping using a specific protocol or adjunct behaviour; for example, frequency of expression, length of time to express, breast massage, relaxation, imagery, conditioning process, expressing breasts sequentially or simultaneously, or support programme specific to milk expression.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

(1) Indicators of maternal satisfaction (or lack of) with method, including acceptability, comfort, ease of use, and achievement of the woman's goal for expressing or pumping.
(2) Indicators of possible adverse outcomes for mother or infant as a result of pumping or expressing, including contamination of milk, injury to mother's breast or other anatomy, reduction or cessation of pumping or expressing due to difficulties with pumping or expressing.

Secondary outcomes

(3) Transfer to feeding at the breast if expressing preceded feeding at the breast.
(4) Quantity of milk expressed.
(5) Time taken to express milk.
(6) Nutrient quality of expressed milk; for example, fat, sodium, energy.

(7) Maternal physiological effects of expressing - prolactin and other hormone levels.
(8) Economic - cost of pump equipment, effect on hospital length of stay for infant, level of healthcare service usage to support expressing or pumping.
The methods section of this review is based on a standard template used by the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

Search methods for identification of studies

The following methods section of this review is based on a standard template used by the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

Electronic searches

We searched the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group's Trials Register by contacting the Trials Search Co-ordinator (21 March 2014).
The Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group's Trials Register is maintained by the Trials Search Co-ordinator and contains trials identified from:

1. monthly searches of the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL);
2. weekly searches of MEDLINE (Ovid);
3. weekly searches of Embase (Ovid);
4. handsearches of 30 journals and the proceedings of major conferences;
5. weekly current awareness alerts for a further 44 journals plus monthly BioMed Central email alerts.

Details of the search strategies for CENTRAL, MEDLINE and Embase, the list of handsearched journals and conference proceedings, and the list of journals reviewed via the current awareness service can be found in the 'Specialized Register' section within the editorial information about the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.
Trials identified through the searching activities described above are each assigned to a review topic (or topics). The Trials Search Co-ordinator searches the register for each review using the topic list rather than keywords.
In addition, we searched CINAHL (1982 to 21 March 2014) and set monthly e-alerts using the search strategy in Appendix 1.

Searching other resources

We handsearched *Journal of Human Lactation* (from 1985 to February 2014), *Breastfeeding Review* (1982 to February 2014), *Maternal and Child Nutrition* (2005 to February 2014) and conference proceedings from both the International Lactation Consultant Association and the Australian Lactation Consultant Association (1995 to 2013). We contacted experts in the field, and used web site notice boards, e-lists, and journals of professional and voluntary organisations related to breastfeeding to seek additional published or unpublished studies. We examined reference lists of all relevant retrieved papers to identify further studies. We did not apply any language or date restrictions.

Data collection and analysis

For this update we used the following methods when assessing the reports identified by the updated search, which were similar to the methods used in the previous version of the review with differences noted in Appendix 2.
The following methods section of this review is based on a standard template used by the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

Selection of studies

Two review authors (G Becker, HA Smith) independently assessed for inclusion all the potential studies we identified as a result of the search strategy. We resolved any disagreement through discussion or by involving the third review author (F Cooney).

Data extraction and management

We designed a form to extract data. For eligible studies, two of the review authors extracted the data using the agreed form. We resolved discrepancies through discussion or, if required, we consulted the third review author. We entered data into Review Manager software (RevMan 2014) and checked for accuracy. Wherever necessary, we requested unpublished or missing data from the trial contact author.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Two review authors independently assessed risk of bias for each study using the criteria outlined in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011). We resolved any disagreement by discussion or by involving the third review author.

(1) Sequence generation (checking for possible selection bias)

We described for each included study the method used to generate the allocation sequence in sufficient detail to allow an assessment of whether it should produce comparable groups. We assessed the method as:

- low risk (any truly random process, e.g. random number table; computer random number generator);
- high risk (any non-random process, e.g. odd or even date of birth; hospital or clinic record number);
- unclear risk (insufficient information to permit the judgement of low or high risk).

(2) Allocation concealment (checking for possible selection bias)

We described for each included study the method used to conceal the allocation sequence and determined whether intervention allocation could have been foreseen in advance of, or during recruitment, or changed after assignment. When studies did not report any concealment approach, they were considered unclear. We assessed the methods as:

- low risk (e.g. telephone or central randomisation; consecutively numbered sealed opaque envelopes);
- high risk (open random allocation; unsealed or non-opaque envelopes, alternation; date of birth);
- unclear risk (insufficient information to permit the judgement of low or high risk).

(3.1) Blinding of participants and personnel (checking for possible performance bias)

In previous versions of this review it was considered that due to the nature of the interventions evaluated, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible. For this reason the methods for all included studies had been accessed as 'high risk of bias'. For this version of the review, following Cochrane guidelines, we assessed all studies for performance bias as:

- low risk (no or incomplete blinding but the review authors judge that the outcome is not likely to be influenced; blinding of study participants and personnel ensured and unlikely that the blinding could have been broken);
- high risk (outcome is likely to be influenced by no or incomplete blinding; blinding of study participants and personnel attempted, but likely that the blinding could have been broken and the outcome is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding;
- unclear risk (insufficient information to access the risk of bias or the study did not address this outcome).

(3.2) Blinding of outcome assessment (checking for possible detection bias)

We described for each included study the methods used, if any, to blind outcome assessors from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. We assessed blinding separately for different outcomes or classes of outcomes. We assessed the methods as:

- low risk (no blinding of outcome assessment, but the review authors judge that the outcome measurement is not likely to be influenced by lack of blinding; or blinding of outcome assessment ensured, and unlikely that the blinding could have been broken);
- high risk (no blinding of outcome assessment, and the outcome measurement is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding; or blinding of outcome assessment, but likely that the blinding could have been broken, and the outcome measurement is likely to be influenced by lack of blinding);
- unclear risk (insufficient information to permit judgement of 'low risk' or 'high risk; if the outcome was not reported in the study, or clarity was not obtained through communication with the trialist when feasible).

(4) Incomplete outcome data (checking for possible attrition bias through withdrawals, dropouts, protocol deviations)

We indicated for each included study, the completeness of data including attrition and exclusions from the analysis (Characteristics of included studies table). We stated whether attrition and exclusions were reported, the numbers included in the analysis at each stage (compared with the total randomised participants), reasons for attrition or exclusion where reported, and whether missing data were balanced across groups or were related to outcomes. Where sufficient information was reported, or could be supplied by the trial authors, we included the missing data in the analyses undertaken. We calculated the level of completeness to follow-up for all included studies but did not require a minimum level for inclusion. We assessed the methods as:

- low risk (e.g. where there were no missing data or where reasons for missing data were balanced across groups);
- high risk (e.g. where missing data may have related to outcomes or were not balanced across groups);
- unclear risk (e.g. where there was insufficient reporting of attrition or exclusions to permit a judgement to be made).

(5) Selective reporting bias

For each included study we described how we investigated the possibility of selective outcome reporting bias and on our findings. We assessed the methods as:

- low risk (where it is clear that all of the study's pre-specified outcomes and all expected outcomes of interest to the review have been reported);
- high risk (where not all the study's pre-specified outcomes have been reported; one or more reported primary outcomes were not pre-specified; outcomes of interest are reported incompletely and so cannot be used; study fails to include results of a key outcome that would have been expected to have been reported);
- unclear risk.

(6) Other sources of bias

In the notes sections of the Characteristics of included studies table we have recorded any other concerns about bias such as source of funding, any significant deviation from the study protocol, or any extreme baseline imbalance. We assessed whether each study was free of other problems that could put it at risk of bias:

- low risk (study appears to be free of other sources of bias);
- high risk (at least one important risk of bias, e.g. had a potential source of bias related to the specific study design);

- unclear risk (insufficient information to assess whether an important risk of bias exists or insufficient rationale or evidence that an identified problem will introduce bias).

We assessed cross-over trials to see what measures were used to reduce carry over between interventions, whereby the effects of an intervention given in one period persist into a subsequent period, thus interfering with the effects of the different, subsequent intervention. Depending on the outcome being assessed, we considered if any washout period between interventions was adequate as a means of reducing carry-over effects.

(7) Overall risk of bias

We made explicit judgements about whether studies were at high risk of bias, according to the criteria given in the *Handbook* (Higgins 2011). With reference to (1) to (6) above, we assessed the likely magnitude and direction of the bias and whether we considered it likely to impact on the findings. We planned to explore the impact of the level of bias through undertaking sensitivity analyses, temporarily removing studies at high risk of bias from the meta-analysis to see what impact this would have on intervention effects; however, the included studies were not suitable for meta-analysis.

Measures of treatment effect

Dichotomous data

For dichotomous data, we presented results as summary risk ratio with 95% confidence intervals.

Continuous data

For continuous data, we used the mean difference if outcomes were measured in the same unit between trials. If outcomes had been measured in different units between trials, we planned to use the standardised mean difference. In instances in which the outcome data distribution was skewed and not available in a format for transformation, we provided a description of the available results in the text.

Unit of analysis issues

Cross-over trials

Cross-over trials were included for this update of the review, if deemed eligible, along with parallel group trials in the analyses, using the methods described in the *Handbook* (Higgins 2011). We did not include unpaired data from cross-over trials in the analyses, as we sought to use only paired data such that information would be available regarding the within-mother comparison of methods of milk expression. In instances where cross-over trials only reported on unpaired data, we elected to report these descriptively in the text, qualifying that the results need to be interpreted with caution as they arose from a limited analysis.

Studies with more than two intervention groups

For studies that had multi-intervention arms, we first assessed which groups were relevant to this review. If we found that more than two comparison groups were applicable, then we entered data as a single pair-wise comparison into RevMan. In instances in which there were more than two groups to be compared, we took measures to avoid double counting or inappropriate totaling.

Dealing with missing data

For included studies, we noted levels of attrition in the Characteristics of included studies table and summarised information in Table 2. We planned to explore the impact of including studies with high levels of missing data in the overall assessment of treatment effect by using sensitivity analysis.

For all outcomes, we carried out analyses, as far as possible, on an intention-to-treat basis, i.e. we attempted to include all participants randomised to each group in the analyses, and analysed all participants in the group to which they were allocated, regardless of whether or not they received the allocated intervention.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We intended to assess statistical heterogeneity in each meta-analysis using the Tau², I² and Chi² statistics, regarding heterogeneity as substantial if the T² was greater than zero and either an I² was greater than 30% or there was a low P value (less than 0.10) in the Chi² test for heterogeneity. There were insufficient studies included to undertake meta-analysis at this time.

Assessment of reporting biases

We did not formally assess reporting bias; without access to study protocols it is difficult to know whether or not there has been outcome reporting bias. However, we have noted in the Characteristics of included studies table where we had any concerns about reporting bias (e.g. where key outcomes did not seem to be reported). We were unable to assess publication bias using funnel plots, as too few studies contributed data to the analyses. In future updates, if there are 10 or more studies in the meta-analysis, we will investigate reporting biases (such as publication bias) using funnel plots. We will assess funnel plot asymmetry visually. If asymmetry is suggested by a visual assessment, we will perform exploratory analyses to investigate it.

Data synthesis

We carried out statistical analysis using the Review Manager software (RevMan 2014). Studies are presented in the same analysis when referring to a related outcome, however studies were not sufficiently similar to combine for meta-analysis. If further studies are identified in the future for meta-analysis, we will use fixed-effect meta-analysis for combining data where it is reasonable to assume that studies are estimating the same underlying treatment effect: i.e. where trials are examining the same intervention, and where we judge the trials' populations and methods to be sufficiently similar. If there is clinical heterogeneity sufficient to expect that the underlying treatment effects differ between trials, or if substantial statistical heterogeneity is detected, we will use random-effects meta-analysis to produce an overall summary, if we consider an average treatment effect across trials clinically meaningful. We will treat the random-effects summary as the average range of possible treatment effects and we will discuss the clinical implications of treatment effects differing between trials. If the average treatment effect is not clinically meaningful, we will not combine trials.

If we use random-effects analyses, we will present the results as the average treatment effect with 95% confidence intervals, and the estimates of Tau^2 and I^2.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

There were insufficient data to undertake subgroup analyses and investigation of heterogeneity. Had we identified substantial heterogeneity, we had planned to investigate it using subgroup analyses and sensitivity analyses and to consider whether an overall summary was meaningful, and if it was, we planned to use random-effects analysis to produce it. We planned to carry out the following subgroup analyses:

1. gestational age;
2. time since birth when intervention occurred;
3. make and model of pump;
4. trial design;

using the following primary outcomes in subgroup analysis:

1. indicators of maternal satisfaction (or lack of) with method;
2. indicators of possible adverse outcomes for mother or infant as a result of pumping or expressing.

If there are sufficient data in future updates, we will assess subgroup differences by interaction tests available within RevMan (RevMan 2014). We will report the results of subgroup analyses quoting the Chi^2 statistic and P value, and the interaction test I^2 value.

Sensitivity analysis

We planned to carry out sensitivity analysis to explore the effect of trial quality involving analysis based on rating of selection bias and attrition bias to assess for any substantive difference to the overall result. As we have included only a small number of trials, we have not carried out this analysis, but have briefly discussed possible effects of study quality.

RESULTS

Description of studies

See Characteristics of included studies; Characteristics of excluded studies.

Results of the search

The previous two versions of this review combined yielded 27 references through primary searches and 22 additional references in secondary searches. Primary searches for this update yielded an additional nine references, including one of the previous ongoing trials now as a publication (with a different first author), plus three references from secondary searching. Two new trials were found. Conference abstracts were eligible for inclusion and four of the previously included abstracts are now included as full publications. As a result of the amendment to now include cross-over studies within 28 days of birth, all the studies previously excluded for this reason were re-examined. Five previously excluded studies are now included (Bernabe-Garcia 2012; De Carvalho 1985; Garza 1982; Paul 1996; Pittard 1991). One study previously classified as not a randomised controlled trial (RCT) was reclassified following further discussion with the trialist (Prime 2012).

Three published articles reviewed in the previous version reported on two or more protocols within the one study, which we examined as separate studies. The study by Jones randomised participants to either the simultaneous or sequential pumping arm of the trial (Jones 2001) and included a protocol to examine a co-intervention of massage prior to expression using a cross-over design within 28 days of the birth; this previously excluded protocol was now eligible. One study, which the authors referred to as a "multi site, randomised clinical trial", compared pump suction patterns using two separate protocols and including cross-over aspects (Meier 2008). We were not able to make contact with the study authors to clarify data. We considered Protocol I in which all mothers tested three suction patterns of one pump at one site as well as using another pump at other times to be a cross-over within the first 28 days of birth and this previously excluded protocol was now eligible. Protocol II, at three other sites, included a two-arm trial that tested two suction patterns of the same pump for seven days (which we included in this review previously), as well as an aspect in which these participants later also used another pump after the seven days (we considered this comparison a cross-over trial and had not included previously; it was now eligible). The two-arm trial of suction patterns measured total milk output, post-pumping creamatocrit, and maternal perception, which are outcomes of this review, as well as the degree of breast fullness by completion of pumping and percentage of available milk removed, which are not outcomes considered in this review.

Rasmussen 2011 reported on a support protocol (Bassett Improving Breastfeeding Study; BIBS 1) which did not include any as-

pects related to milk expression so we have not considered it for this review. We did consider BIBS 2, which examined the maternal satisfaction and duration outcomes related to type of pump received.

Where there was insufficient information in the published material to categorise a study, we attempted to contact the author. There are three studies that cannot be definitively categorised as included or excluded at this time (Alekseev 1998; Heon 2011; Yu 2014) and we have therefore briefly described them in Characteristics of studies awaiting classification.

Included studies

After screening there were 34 included studies (n = 1998). Twenty-one studies were parallel design and 13 studies were cross-over designs or include an aspect of the trial with a cross-over design. Twenty-one of the trials referred to mothers of preterm or ill infants in neonatal units (n = 1293) and 12 referred to mothers of healthy term infants (n = 689), with one trial containing mothers of both neonatal and healthy older infants (n = 16).

Setting

Trials were conducted in the USA (n = 22), UK (n = 4) and one study each in Malaysia, Brazil, Egypt, India, Mexico, Australia, Turkey, and a two-site study in Kenya and Nigeria. All mothers were described as healthy, with one trial including only obese mothers (body mass index greater than 29 kg/m2) (Rasmussen 2011). We requested clarification or additional data from authors of all included studies and the responses, or lack of, are included in the study details. We have provided study details in the table Characteristics of included studies.

Interventions

The majority of included studies referred to one or more types of pumps. We have described the types of pumps used in Table 2. Eight studies (Boo 2001; Flaherman 2012; Garza 1982, Paul 1996, Pessoto 2010; Pittard 1991; Slusher 2007; Zinaman 1992) included hand expression of milk as well as pumping and 14 studies compared two or more types of pumps or suction patterns (Bernabe-Garcia 2012; Boutte 1985; Burton 2013; Fewtrell 2001a; Fewtrell 2001b; Francis 2008; Hayes 2008; Hopkinson 2009; Meier 2008; Meier 2012; Pessoto 2010; Rasmussen 2011; Slusher 2007; Zinaman 1992), with three of these studies comparing both hand expression and multiple pump types (Slusher 2007; Pessoto 2010; Zinaman 1992). Fifteen studies examined a specified protocol or adjunct behaviour, including sequential versus simultaneous pumping protocols (Auerbach 1990; Groh-Wargo 1995; Hill 1999; Jones 2001; Prime 2012), frequency of expression (De Carvalho 1985), provision of a milk expression education and support intervention to mothers of preterm infants (Ahmed 2008), provision of audio/visual relaxation to mothers of preterm infants (Feher 1989; Keith 2012), timing of initiation of pumping related to milk volume among mothers of very low birthweight infants (Parker 2012), breast massage before pumping (Jones 2001; Stutte 1988), therapeutic touch (Mersmann 1994), warming breasts before pumping (Yigit 2012) and a breast cleansing protocol (Costa 1989). Stellwagen 2010 compared a group taught "Hands on Pumping" that combined hand expression with electric pump usage with a control group using the pump only.

Outcomes

The review was able to meet in part its objectives to assess acceptability (including maternal satisfaction with the method), bacterial contamination, effectiveness (including quantity of milk, time taken), effect on milk composition, and cost implication (related to infant length of stay in a neonatal unit only) though not able to assess safety, achievement of maternal goals for expressing or pumping, or other aspects of cost, as none of the studies we found examined these areas.

Maternal satisfaction/acceptability

Seventeen studies examined some element of acceptability, maternal satisfaction or mother's views on using pump equipment or technique, with nine of these studies providing details on the aspects assessed (Bernabe-Garcia 2012; Burton 2013; Fewtrell 2001a; Fewtrell 2001b; Flaherman 2012; Hopkinson 2009; Meier 2008; Meier 2012; Mersmann 1994). Seven studies reported maternal satisfaction findings descriptively only (Ahmed 2008; Auerbach 1990; Boutte 1985; Feher 1989; Hill 1999; Jones 2001; Paul 1996), and one study did not reported on this aspect though included it in their methods Rasmussen 2011). None of the studies found specifically asked mothers if they had achieved their own goals for expressing or pumping. See Characteristics of included studies

Adverse outcomes/contamination

Adverse effects resulting from bacterial contamination of milk expressed by pump or hand expression were reported in four studies (Boo 2001; Costa 1989; Pessoto 2010; Pittard 1991), as well as infant death, infants developing necrotising enterocolitis and sepsis (Boo 2001). Maternal pain or nipple damage reported in three studies (Fewtrell 2001b; Flaherman 2012; Pessoto 2010).See Characteristics of included studies

Transfer to feeding at the breast

For the secondary outcomes of the review, Ahmed 2008, Boo 2001 and Burton 2013, reported on the proportion of infants breastfeeding on discharge from the neonatal intensive care unit, which is used in this review as a proxy for transfer to feeding at the breast.

Effectiveness: Quantity of milk and time taken

The quantity of milk expressed was examined in 27 studies with 13 studies providing data for analysis. The measures used in trials varied widely from a single expression to 60 days, which restricted comparison among trials (Table 3). Most studies instructed the

mother to continue pumping until the milk flow slowed or ceased. A maximum time limit per pumping session was set in nine studies (Table 3).

Milk removal facilitates milk production (Wilde 1995). If use of a pump on one or more occasions enables a mother to remove more milk, her milk production may also be higher on following occasions. Therefore, in a cross-over design comparing pumps, time-lag is important when measuring milk production outcomes: there needs to be sufficient time between pump tests (including any familiarisation period involving pumping) to allow for the effect of any additional milk produced to recede. Eleven studies provided different familiarisation times and 'washout' periods (Table 3).

Time taken to pump milk was examined in six studies with reference to sequential versus simultaneous pumping protocols (Auerbach 1990; Fewtrell 2001b; Groh-Wargo 1995; Hill 1999; Jones 2001; Prime 2012); measures reported varied (Table 3).

Effect on milk composition/nutrients

An aspect of nutrient content was measured in 14 studies. Fat content was measured in 13 studies with three reporting data in a format suitable for analysis in this review (Feher 1989; Keith 2012; Stutte 1988). Two studies provided data on other nutrients: protein, sodium, potassium and total energy (Pessoto 2010, unpublished data provided by author), total nitrogen (Garza 1982), and for two other studies the data were not in a format suitable for analysis: protein, lactose, and energy, (Bernabe-Garcia 2012), and energy, protein and carbohydrate content (Stellwagen 2010).

Maternal physiological effects

Maternal physiological effects of expressing or pumping are reflected in prolactin and oxytocin hormone responses as well as other physiological changes. Seven studies reported a physiological effect, with data from two included for analysis (Groh-Wargo 1995; Francis 2008 (unpublished manuscript)).

Economic implications

Length of stay in a neonatal unit is an important economic consideration, though the high number of variables in these infants makes the comparison difficult to evaluate. None of the included studies randomised infants. Boo 2001 reported on the median duration of infant stay in the hand expression and pumping groups; however, these data were not used in this review as many infants were not receiving any of the milk their mothers expressed or pumped. Most of the studies mention staff assisting the mothers to use the methods of milk expression or pumping, though none explored the time cost of providing this assistance or if it varied between method or protocol. Bernabe-Garcia 2012 discusses that large electric pumps are not affordable in developing countries and their study examined only lower cost manual pumps and reported costs to the mother of the four pumps examined. Slusher 2007 studied two African special care nurseries in Kenya and Nigeria with limited resources including lack of refrigeration to store expressed milk. In this study, the equipment used in the trial was not available locally but rather had been donated by the manufacturers and the USA cost of the electric pumps and other equipment was provided by the author in additional information. A secondary analysis by Jegier 2010 of data in the study by Meier 2008 describes the costs involved in providing pumped own mother's milk, compared to donor bank human milk and preterm formula, which were not comparisons included in this review.

Excluded studies

We excluded 22 studies. Full details are available in the Characteristics of excluded studies.

Risk of bias in included studies

We assessed each trial for quality as outlined in the Methods section. Summary descriptions of the assessments on the risk of bias are available in Figure 1 and Figure 2. Details of the assessment for each trial are set out the Characteristics of included studies.

Figure 1. 'Risk of bias' graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.



Figure 2. 'Risk of bias' summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.

Allocation

Of the 34 included studies, only one used quasi-randomisation (Costa 1989). We judged two of the 34 RCTs to have high risk of bias for sequence generation and allocation concealment (Costa 1989; Prime 2012), nine to have low risk of bias on both aspects, and 12 trials to be low risk of bias on only one of these two aspects of allocation. For a further 10 trials, the adequacy of the methods used for allocation was unclear.

The Ahmed 2008 study had twice as many multipara (60%) in the intervention group as in the control group (30%), strongly indicating possible selection bias. As the outcome of interest is breastfeeding, the difference of mothers with prior breastfeeding experience could impact on the results of the study. It is therefore difficult to tell if the difference observed between mothers in the intervention and control group who were breastfeeding on discharge (risk ratio (RR) 2, 95% confidence interval (CI) 1.25 to 3.21, P = 0.004) is due to the effectiveness of the intervention or the characteristics of the participants.

Blinding

Blinding of mothers and care providers was not feasible in almost all of these trials and this may be a source of bias. One study (Auerbach 1990) was judged as high risk because the single researcher had carried out all aspects of the trial. Only one trial clearly reported (as a doctoral thesis) how the blinding of mothers was undertaken, which involved a Theraputic Touch intervention (Mersmann 1994). One trial with two protocols which involved a comparison of suction levels of an electric pump, reported blinding of mothers for both parts though only reported on blinding of personnel for one part and thus is judged as unclear risk of bias (Meier 2008). Blinding of some or all of the outcome assessors was reported for eight trials (Boutte 1985; Groh-Wargo 1995; Hill 1999; Hopkinson 2009; Keith 2012; Pessoto 2010; Rasmussen 2011; Stutte 1988). For the remainder of the studies there was insufficient information to judge the risk of bias and are thus marked as unclear risk.

Incomplete outcome data

We judged six studies as having a high risk of bias related to incomplete data outcomes reported (Boo 2001; De Carvalho 1985; Fewtrell 2001a; Francis 2008; Jones 2001; Pessoto 2010), including participants missing and not mentioned, unclear cross-over process, no information how incomplete data were handled, and missing samples. Ten studies were judged as unclear risk due to no information available. The remaining 18 studies were judged to be low risk.

Levels of attrition are described in Table 2 and were quite variable. In some instances, despite responses from trialists, there was insufficient information on the losses of participants or on the missing data to fully assess the quality of all aspects of those studies.

Selective reporting

For most studies, we could only access information reported in the published papers and if the paper reported all the outcomes listed in the study design, then it is marked as low risk (24 studies). Five studies were marked as high risk due to findings not reported in allocated groups, or where one publication (trial register, protocol or linked article) mentioned an intervention or analysis that was not reported on in any publication of the trial, or where the time period reported on was different than stated in the study design (Boo 2001; Flaherman 2012; Francis 2008; Meier 2012; Slusher 2007).

Five studies are marked as unclear risk due to cross-over data not reported as pair data, results reported descriptively without data shown, published only as a conference abstract with limited details or no information available on which to base a judgement (Fewtrell 2001a; Jones 2001; Parker 2012; Pessoto 2010; Stellwagen 2010).

Other potential sources of bias

Other potential sources of bias arose from violation from protocol in the use of a special elasticated bra that held the pump "hands free" was provided only to a minority of participants (Hopkinson 2009), lack of clarity about participants receiving the educational intervention (Ahmed 2008), too short a 'wash out period' between pump use, or unclear time since last breastfeed, in cross-over trials (Bernabe-Garcia 2012; Paul 1996; Prime 2012), participants in the intervention groups receiving additional support and contact from the research nurse above that necessary for the intervention (Groh-Wargo 1995), possible violations of protocol noted by trialists with mothers using different pumps than those assigned (Hayes 2008), and no inclusion/exclusion criteria given (Pittard 1991).

The study procedure used by Boo 2001 did not obtain the same number of further samples from all mothers participating in the study, with more samples being obtained only from mothers whose first sample was contaminated, and later results not reported in randomised groups, resulting in the erroneous finding reported that contaminated samples were more common in one method than the other.

Fourteen of the 24 studies which compared pumps stated that support was provided by the manufacturers of the equipment being studied plus one study received funding from the anti-bacterial agent studied. Studies have potential for bias when funded by manufacturers to test their products or to evaluate them compared to other products. Nine studies received funding from their academic institutions or not-for-profit organisations, with some studies receiving funding from more than one source (Table 2).

Bias common to other trials, such as possible contamination between groups, additional support to participants or just interest from the researcher, could also apply to these types of studies, as well as publication bias towards interesting results and English language.

Effects of interventions

Of the 34 studies eligible for inclusion involving 1998 women, 17 studies contributed data, involving 961 women, which could be entered into RevMan (Ahmed 2008; Bernabe-Garcia 2012; Boo 2001; Burton 2013; Feher 1989; Fewtrell 2001b; Flaherman 2012; Francis 2008; Garza 1982; Groh-Wargo 1995; Hill 1999; Hopkinson 2009; Keith 2012; Pessoto 2010; Slusher 2007; Stutte 1988; Yiğ it 2012). Seven of the eight outcomes listed in the protocol for this review as described above were addressed by one or more of the 17 included studies with useable data. We added four additional comparisons to accommodate two new studies not available for the previous reviews; one study previously excluded as a cross-over within the first 28 days, and one study included previously though it had no data at that time which since had become available. The additional comparisons compared any type of manual pump with any other type of manual pump; compared any type of battery or small electric pump with any other type of battery or small electric pump; and two comparisons related to breast massage and to warming the breast. We were able to populate 12 of the 14 comparisons.

Variations among protocols, pump equipment and outcomes reported across the included studies allowed only limited statistical comparisons to be made. Data were compared in the most specific comparison; for example, if the pump type was specified as a "manual pump", it was compared as that category rather than "any type of pump" category. Confidence intervals in most comparisons indicated a very wide range of values and data were insufficient to judge if values were a normal distribution. We have presented full details in the graphs, which are arranged by comparison between pump types or methods.

Primary outcomes

Maternal satisfaction with method

Sixteen studies reported on maternal satisfaction in which there was comparison of various methods of milk expression which included simultaneous versus sequential breast pumping, different types of breast pumps as well as the effects of an educational and a relaxation intervention. One study provided data suitable for analysis in RevMan (Flaherman 2012). The methods examined in each study differed and the descriptive findings reported did not suggest any clear effect related to maternal satisfaction. Descriptive results, where available, are provided in Table 4.

Two studies reported descriptively on maternal satisfaction in trials involving two different types of electric pumps. In a comparison of a standard to a novel small electric pump, Hopkinson 2009 (n = 62) reported that mothers' ranking of the two pumps did not differ on eight of 10 aspects of the pump, based on their experience in using of the pump over two to three weeks. Examining another two pump brands, Burton 2013 (n = 71) reported a higher preference for a less costly pump based on its ease of use and the position of the control button than for the large electric pump, with no other items differing significantly between the groups.

The same manual pump (Avent ISIS) was preferred by women, using the same questionnaire and scale, both in a trial comparing it to a small electric/battery hand-held pump (Fewtrell 2001a) and to a large electric pump (Fewtrell 2001b). In a cross-over trial with mothers of term healthy infants aged approximately eight weeks (Fewtrell 2001a) (n = 60), mothers' ratings of a small electric/battery and a manual pump over 48 hours of use are reported. Unpaired analysis of mothers' overall ratings of each pump was reported with no information provided on the within-mother rating of each pump. As a consequence of this, caution is required in the interpretation of the study's results. Overall, mothers reported higher satisfaction with the manual pump but found no difference between the pumps for ease of use. A parallel group trial assessed mothers of preterm infants assigned to either a manual pump or a large electric pump within three days of giving birth and used for a range of seven to 30 days.This study also reported higher maternal satisfaction for the manual pump compared to the electric pump (Fewtrell 2001b, n = 145).

In the study by Boutte 1985, (n = 9) comparing a large electric to a manual pump the subjective responses for each type of pump are reported as being similar apart from ease of operation, for which there was a marked preference (70%) for the electric pump. Rasmussen 2011 (n = 39), comparing a manual and large electric pump, did not report their findings related to maternal views in the published paper.

In a cross-over study mothers alternated between hand expression and using a manual pump on postnatal day four and five and expressed a preference for the manual pump in both Phase I (n = 22) and in Phase II with a different sample, (n = 14), however, the Phase II sample also reported at postnatal day eight and nine and found the opposite at the later time, with a preference for hand expression at this time (Paul 1996).

A cross-over trial comparing four manual pumps used by mothers with hospitalised preterm infants reported a significant difference in the maternal preferences (Bernabe-Garcia 2012).

Meier 2008 (n = 65) reported there was no significant difference in the maternal evaluation of efficiency, efficacy, comfort or convenience in either group comparing two suction patterns of one large electric pump. Meier 2012 (n = 128) a cross-over study examining varying breast pump suction patterns (BPSPs) descriptively reported a statistical significant difference in mothers reporting that the new experimental maintenance BPSP was not as comfortable

compared to the experimental initiation BPSP and that "mothers did not like the 'suction strength' of the new experimental maintenance BPSP".

Three studies reported on maternal satisfaction comparing simultaneous versus sequential breast pumping. One study (Auerbach 1990, n = 25) reported a preference for simultaneous pumping compared to the single sequential option by three to one , while two studies (Hill 1999 (n = 49) and Jones 2001 (n = 52)) did not find any overall preference among mothers for either of these techniques.

Three other studies looked at maternal satisfaction with other interventions to facilitate milk expression. Feher 1989 (n = 71) examined the effect of a 20-minute audio relaxation and imagery tape to increase volume and fat content of milk pumped and reported that mothers were positive in their response on using the relaxation technique. Ahmed 2008 (n = 60) used the acquisition of knowledge and skills as an indicator of mothers reaching their goal of breastfeeding and reported that mothers who received an educational programme were more likely to start milk expression earlier compared to mothers in the control group (P < 0.004). Mersmann 1994 (n = 18) reported that all mothers in this cross-over study found both the Theraputic Touch and the Mimic Theraputic Touch treatments helped them relax, but no significant difference in perception when asked to choose "which treatment they perceived as better".

One RCT examined mothers self-reported efficacy using either hand expression or an electric pump (Flaherman 2012). Self-efficacy was assessed by asking mothers if they agreed or disagreed with the following statement: 'I don't want anyone to see me (hand expressing/pumping)'. The study found that mothers who were hand expressing were more likely to disagree with the statement compared to mothers using the electric pump, (mean difference (MD) -0.70, 95% confidence interval (CI) -1.25 to -0.15, P = 0.01), (Analysis 5.1). Mothers who were hand expressing reported the instructions for expression to be clearer compared to the electric pump, (MD 0.40, 95% CI 0.05 to 0.75, P = 0.02) (Analysis 5.2).

Adverse effects

Adverse effects on milk

We found no significant differences between methods related to contamination of the milk in two studies providing data for analysis (Boo 2001 comparing any type of pump to hand expression ,one study, n = 28, risk ratio (RR) 0.89, 95% CI 0.62 to 1.27, P = 0.51, Analysis 1.1.1; Pessoto 2010 comparing a manual pump to hand expression,one study, n = 142 milk samples, MD 0.20, 95% CI -0.18 to 0.58, P = 0.30, Analysis 2.1.1; comparing a large electric pump to hand expression, one study, n = 123 milk samples, MD 0.10, 95% CI -0.29 to 0.49, P = 0.61 Analysis 5.3.2; comparing a large electric pump to a manual pump,one study, n = 141 milk samples, MD -0.10, 95% CI -0.46 to 0.26, P = 0.59 Analysis 8.1), and Pittard 1991 (n = 16), a cross-over study comparing a large electric pump to hand expression, reported the number of specimens with less than or greater than 10,000 CFU/mL did not differ between those collected with hand expression versus an electric pump. Comparing breast cleansing with an antibacterial soap to washing with water descriptively reported lower staphylococcus colony counts in the breast cleansing group (P = 0.013) (Costa 1989, n = 65).

Adverse effects on infants

Infant death, infants developing necrotising enterocolitis and sepsis were examined in one study (Boo 2001). However, as the infants did not all receive their mothers' expressed milk, with some receiving only formula milk, a mixture of milks or no enteral feeds, we have not included the results for infant illness related to mother's method of milk expression in this review.

Adverse effects on mothers

No significant differences in the mean breast pain measured on a scale of one to 10 was found comparing a large electric pump to hand expression (Flaherman 2012, data from 2010 conference abstract, one study, n = 68, MD 0.02, 95% CI -0.67 to 0.71, P = 0.96, Analysis 5.3.1). In Pessoto 2010, there was no maternal nipple damage reported in the hand expression group, and one case of nipple damage in each of the manual pump and in the large electric pump groups Fewtrell 2001b, comparing a different manual and large electric pump, reported similar proportions developed sore nipples (7% both groups) or engorgement (4% manual versus 6% electric) and 2% using the electric pump developed mastitis.

Secondary outcomes

Transfer to feeding at the breast if expressing preceded feeding at the breast

Three studies reported infant breastfeeding at discharge from the neonatal unit. One study finding no significant difference between the mothers who pumped and who hand expressed (Boo 2001), (Analysis 1.2); and another study found that mothers who participated in an educational breastfeeding programme were more likely to be breastfeeding at discharge (Ahmed 2008), (Analysis 12.1). Burton 2013 reports descriptively that after controlling for potential confounders (birthweight, gestational age and infant age at discharge) the infants of mothers using the small electric pump with 'petal compression' were more likely to be breastfeeding at discharge from the neonatal unit than those using the large electric pump (adjusted odds ratio (OR) 7.52, 95% CI 1.79 to 32.89).

Quantity of milk expressed

Techniques

Eight studies examined techniques to increase the quantity of milk obtained that were unrelated to a type of pump and all found these techniques (relaxation, warmth, massage, early initiation of pumping and increased frequency of pumping) significantly increased the quantity obtained.

Mothers with infants in a neonatal unit who were provided with a relaxation tape during the second week after birth were significantly more likely to obtain a greater quantity of milk (MD 34.70 mL) at one pumping session than women not provided with the relaxation tape (Feher 1989), (Analysis 11.1). Similarly, mothers of preterm infants provided with any of three separate music-listening interventions of approximately 12 minutes duration to use while pumping obtained significantly more milk than the control group on all 14 days of the study with an increasing difference of quantity (mean over 14 days of study: control 166 mL, any intervention 317.2 mL, range 297.5 to 449.9 mL). (Keith 2012), (Analysis 11.1) Theraputic touch (TT) is a non-contact treatment where the therapy practitioner assumes a meditative awareness to focus on the energy-field of the recipient (here it is the mother), which can produce relaxation. Mersmann 1994 (n = 18) examined this treatment and reported for intra-participant analyses that "mothers expressed significantly more milk after TT than MTT (mimicTT) (EF = 0.75) or no treatment (EF = 0.85) ($P < 0.05$)" (EF = effect size).

Yiğit 2012, n = 39, reported that mothers pumped significantly more milk from their warmed breast compared to their non-warmed breast during five of six pumping sessions over three days. MD over all sessions 11.94 mL, (Analysis 14.1).

In a cross-over study and paired analysis, massage of the breast with pumping showed an higher quantity obtained over two pumping sessions compared to no massage (one study, Stutte 1988, n = 72, MD 4.82 mL, 95% CI 1.25 to 8.39, P = 0.008) (Analysis 13.1). A significantly higher quantity with massage was also reported (descriptively) by Jones 2001. Stellwagen 2010 reported that hand expression combined with use of a large electric pump produced higher, but non-significant, milk volume at each collection over five weeks (data available were insufficient for inclusion in analysis).

Initiation of milk pumping within 60 minutes of birth of a very low birthweight infant obtained higher mean milk quantity at all times measured in the first week than the group who initiated pumping later (Parker 2012, n = 20, mean group total of all milk volume days one to seven, 1374.7 mL versus 608.1 mL, P = 0.05).

A cross-over study (n = 25) (De Carvalho 1985) reported that increased frequency of pumping (four or more times per day) was associated with a significantly greater milk production than infrequent pumping (three or less times a day).

Six studies examined an aspect of the way the pumping was carried out. The quantity of milk expressed did not show a difference in volume between simultaneous and sequential pumping with an electric pump in two parallel group studies providing data for analysis (Hill 1999; Groh-Wargo 1995), (Analysis 10.1). A cross-over study and paired two-tailed test of differences between the means of unlimited time simultaneous versus unlimited time sequential pumping was reported as non-significant by Auerbach 1990. Three studies did not report on this outcome in a way that their data could be included in the analysis (Fewtrell 2001b parallel study) (Jones 2001, Prime 2012, cross-overs).

Types of pumps or hand expression

Fourteen studies, not all with data for analysis, examined milk volume that involved comparing various types and brands of pump or hand expression and found no pump consistently significantly increased the milk volume obtained.

Comparing hand expression with using a foot pedal powered version of a large electric pump with double collection set found a significant difference in milk volume obtained during a six-day period of pumping in the first two weeks after birth (Slusher 2007), though no significant difference was shown in the volume of milk on day five after birth between a manual hand pump and hand expression (Pessoto 2010), (Analysis 2.2)).

Three studies (Flaherman 2012; Pessoto 2010; Slusher 2007) compared hand expression to the same model of large electric pump using different measures with inconsistent results (Analysis 5.4).

A different large electric pump reported a 90% greater quantity obtained with the pump when one breast was pumped in two test sessions during the fourth week of lactation (n = 18, Garza 1982, no data available for analysis).

A cross-over study with mothers of eight-week old term healthy infants comparing a small battery/electric pump with a manual pump reported no significant difference in the total milk quantity from paired results for each mother in single 20-minute test sessions (one study, n = 58, Fewtrell 2001a, no data available for analysis).

Comparison of two models of small battery/electric pumps (Medela Swing and Avent Uno) found no significant difference in the mean quantity of milk obtained from one expression (Francis 2008), (Analysis 7.1) Two different models of small electric pump (Medela Pump in Style and Playtex Embrace) did not show a significant difference in change in 24-hour milk production when compared (Hopkinson 2009), (Analysis 7.2).

No significant difference in quantity of milk was shown comparing a manual pump with using a large electric pump in three studies with different pumps and measurements (Fewtrell 2001b; Pessoto 2010; Slusher 2007), (Analysis 8.2), or in a cross-over study (Boutte 1985), though this did not provide between women differences (data from published paper).

Two studies compared a large electric pump with one or more

small battery/electric pumps with all studies using different brands of pumps and different measures, finding a significantly lower quantity of milk from for one small pump compared to the large electric pump (Francis 2008), (Analysis 9.1) and no difference for other brands of small pumps tested (Burton 2013), (Analysis 9.2). One cross-over study with paired data (Bernabe-Garcia 2012) compared four manual pumps finding the quantity of milk was significantly lower from the Evenflo pump compared to either the Harmony or Isis with no significant differences in quantity obtained between the other comparisons (additional data from trialist) (Analysis 3.1).

Two suction patterns tested for a large electric pump were reported as not significantly different in total milk output per day (Meier 2008). Results from a further development of suction patterns reported an increase in milk output associated with specific patterns. (Meier 2012). Data not available for analysis for either study.

One cross-over trial reported that women using the large electric double pump obtained a greater volume in one test session (15 minutes per breast) than when using a manual pump, a battery pump or hand expression (no data available) (Zinaman 1992).

Time taken to express milk

Eight studies reported time taken to pump and these reported different measures as well as different pumps and methods of use. While some pumps types were faster, the variety of pumps tested did not allow a clear conclusion to be drawn about pump types. Findings were also mixed for the volume per time when simultaneous pumping was compared to sequential pumping.

Francis 2008 compared two small electric and one large electric pump finding that for one expression that one brand of small electric pump (Swing) was significantly faster than the other small electric pump (Uno) MD 4.00 minutes/session, (Analysis 7.3) and both the small electric pumps were slower when compared to the large electric (Whitlestone) pump (Analysis 9.3). Burton 2013 found no difference in the time used each day between the large electric pump (Medela Symphony) and the smaller electric pump (Philips Avent Twin) (Analysis 9.3). Bernabe-Garcia 2012 (n = 28) reported no difference for the mean time for each of the four manual pumps in a cross-over trial reported as between groups, not as paired analysis.

Mothers who used simultaneous pumping spent significantly less time pumping than mothers in the sequential pumping group for a similar milk volume produced and a similar number of pumping sessions in one study, (Groh-Wargo 1995) (Analysis 10.2). Mothers who used a large electric pump (Ameda) spent significantly less time pumping than mothers who used a manual pump (Isis) in another study (Fewtrell 2001b), (Analysis 8.3), however, the trialists note that the majority of the mothers using the electric pump were also pumping both breasts simultaneously, which was not possible with the manual pump, and calculated milk output per breast per minute for the whole study, reporting a non significant higher output in the manual pump group compared to exclusively simultaneous pumping with the electric pump (3.1 mL/breast/min (SD = 2.5) versus 2.4 mL/breast/min (SD = 1.9), P = 0.2). Auerbach 1990 (n = 26), reporting on the measure of pumping "until the mother no longer observed milk dripping from at least one breast" stated that "during the sequential pumping period, mean pumping time was 10.6 minutes (range seven to 22 minutes), and during simultaneous pumping, mean pumping time was 12 minutes (range five to 22 minutes)". Hill 1999 and Jones 2001 reported only descriptively on the time element, stating that simultaneous pumping took about half the time of sequential pumping and did not report volume per time.

In all the studies, the time taken related only to actual pumping time and did not report any time used for pump cleaning or assembly. The time taken to pump over a study period also relates to the frequency of pumping. The frequency of pumping recommended to mothers varied across the studies ranging from three to 12 times a day; however, the recommended frequencies were not achieved by most mothers (Table 5).

Nutrient quality of milk

Nine studies reported outcomes related to nutrient content with five studies providing data for analysis. Protein concentration varied between the four methods tested, though not consistently. Sodium was found to be higher and potassium lower in milk expressed by hand compared to two pumps. There was no significant difference found in energy content (kcal/L) between milk expressed by hand and by two pumps. Fat content was higher with breast massage when pumping and variable with relaxation methods.

Pessoto 2010 found protein was significantly higher in the milk expressed by hand compared to using a manual pump (Analysis 2.4); and lower with the manual pump compared to using a large electric pump (Analysis 8.5), and no difference in protein between in the milk obtained using the large electric pump compared to hand expression, and Garza 1982 found no difference in total nitrogen in milk obtained by using a large electric pump compared to hand expression (Analysis 5.5).

There was a significantly higher sodium concentration in the milk expressed by hand compared to using a manual pump (Pessoto 2010), (Analysis 2.4), and compared to the large electric pump (Analysis 5.6); there was no difference in sodium concentration between the electric pump and the manual pump (Analysis 8.4). Potassium concentration was lower in the milk expressed by hand compared to using the manual pump (Pessoto 2010), (Analysis 2.3) or compared to the electric pump (Analysis 5.5); there was no difference in potassium concentration between the large electric pump and the manual pump (Analysis 8.4).

Pessoto 2010 found no significant difference in energy content (kcal/L) between milk obtained by hand and by using any pump (Analysis 2.3); by using the large electric pump compared to hand

expression or between the electric pump and the manual pump (Analysis 8.4).

Fat content (creamatocrit) was significantly higher with massage of the breast while pumping compared to no massage (Stutte 1988), (Analysis 13.2). A significantly higher fat concentration with massage was also reported (descriptively) by Jones 2001. One study, Keith 2012, which used three relaxation interventions showed a significantly higher fat content for three of the four chosen time points, with an overall mean of 44.8 g/L for the control group compared to 50.9 to 65 g/L of the interventions (Analysis 11.2). No difference was found in the fat content of milk pumped by mothers who were and were not provided with a relaxation tape in another study (Feher 1989), (Analysis 11.3). Creamatocrits were higher at the end of 10 minutes' pumping, and the reported MD for change in fat from beginning to end of pumping for each woman between the standard (Medela Pump In Style) and the novel pump (Playtex Embrace) was 6.72 g/L, SD 21.4 g/L, P = 0.019 (Hopkinson 2009; additional information from trialist, cross-over study). Nutritional composition for protein, fat and lactose was reported as similar across four manual pumps in a cross-over study; data were reported as unpaired data and were not entered for analysis (Bernabe-Garcia 2012).

Maternal physiological effect

No consistent effect was found related to prolactin change or effect on oxytocin release with pump type or method.

The mean serum prolactin change was found to be not significantly different for simultaneous versus sequential pumping of milk (Groh-Wargo 1995), (Analysis 10.3). Prolactin response was descriptively reported to be higher in a large electric pump used simultaneously than with hand expression, a manual pump or a battery pump in a cross-over study (Zinaman 1992). The novel pump was reported to trigger a greater release of prolactin than the standard pump with a median percentage increase in prolactin (%AUC) of 82.8% (29.5% to 122.8%) with the novel pump compared to 16.1% (6.8% to 56.6%) (P = 0.018) (Hopkinson 2009). There was no significant difference in time to first milk ejection (oxytocin release) between two small electric pumps (Analysis 7.4), and no difference was found between a large electric pump (Whittlestone) and either of the smaller pumps (UNO or Swing) (Analysis 9.4), (Francis 2008), or between simultaneous and sequential pumping in a cross-over study reported as group differences (Prime 2012).

There was no significant difference in oxytocin rise descriptively reported between two other pumps (Hopkinson 2009), or comparing three types of pumps and hand expression (Zinaman 1992). In a cross-over study, more mothers experienced milk leaking (oxytocin release) with Theraputic Touch (28%) than mimic Theraputic Touch (6%) or no Theraputic Touch (0%), reported by Mersmann 1994.

Economic outcomes

No study reported data on economic outcomes in a useable way for this review.

DISCUSSION

Summary of main results

Consistent, significant differences in outcomes in milk expression were related to techniques such as early initiation of pumping, increased frequency of pumping, warming of breast, massage of breast and relaxation and therapeutic touch. There were no clear differences for outcomes from comparisons of pumps. The result reported in earlier versions of this review that more milk was obtained at one expression when a focused relaxation tape was provided (Feher 1989) is strengthened by the new trial by Keith 2012 showing a similar significant increase, when the audio tape is listened to while pumping. The doctoral thesis of Mersmann 1994 examined Theraputic Touch, which can produce relaxation, showing an increase in milk volume obtained. It may be that any form of relaxation aids the volume of milk obtained.

Another study new to this update indicated that warming the breast before pumping obtained significantly more milk than from non-warmed breasts (Yi it 2012). No baseline measurements were reported for the mothers prior to taking part in the trial and thus it is unknown if the intervention of warming the breast significantly increased the production of milk or if the differences found between breasts were independent of the intervention.

The effect of massage on milk volume in the descriptive report from Jones 2001 is reinforced by the newly included analysis of Stutte 1988 that showed an higher quantity of milk from massage of the breast while pumping. Initiation of pumping for a very low birthweight infant within one hour of birth produced significantly higher mean volumes of milk than when initiation was later (Parker 2012).

Hyponatremia can be a concern in preterm infants receiving human milk, and findings from one study indicate a 19.35% to 22.65% (P = 0.002) higher sodium content in hand expressed milk compared to manual or electric pump use (Pessoto 2010), a similar finding to a previous cross-over trial (Lang 1994). Differences were also found in the potassium content, which was lower in hand expressed milk (Pessoto 2010).

The techniques described above are all low-resource, low-technology interventions that should generally be available worldwide, though training is required for the specific technique of Theraputic Touch.

For most outcomes examined in this review, there were no clear differences between methods of milk expression. Maternal satisfaction with milk expression was reported in half of the included

studies and within these 16 reports, a wide variety of pump types, methods and scales were employed with only one study providing any data suitable for analysis in RevMan.

There was no difference in incidence of milk contamination found between hand expression and mother's own choice of any manual pump (Boo 2001) or between hand expression, a manual pump and an electric pump (Pessoto 2010). The levels of contamination considered to be above normal milk bacterial flora are similar in Costa 1989 and Boo 2001, 5 x 10^4 colony forming units (CFU)/mL; however, as the authors point out, it is not known how different levels of these normal flora affect preterm or ill infants. Contamination can result from the equipment for pumping, storage, or feeding the milk, and from the mother or other person handling the milk. It would be necessary to examine the whole chain of events to determine where contamination was occurring. Costa 1989's one-time use of a breast cleansing process reduced bacterial counts in the milk sample, though as she points out, the feasibility of using soap and an anti-bacterial agent on the breasts six to eight times a day raises concerns both for the mothers' skin and the mothers' willingness to continue this process for a length of time; there may also be concerns over residues of the anti-bacterial agent in the expressed milk.

Adverse effects related to the mothers were reported in three studies with two incidences of nipple damage in both pump groups (n = 2/44) and none in the hand expression group (Pessoto 2010), no significant difference in mean breast pain comparing a large electric pump to hand expression (Flaherman 2012), similar levels of sore nipples and engorgement, and two women in the large electric pump group developing mastitis compared to none in the manual pump group (Fewtrell 2001b); though in all these studies the actual numbers reporting adverse effects were small. Slusher 2007 provided additional data on the reasons mothers gave when they requested to stop using the pump assigned, with four of the seven mothers stating that pumping was uncomfortable. One mother was using an electric pump and three were using the foot pedal powered version of the same pump.

It was not possible to answer the question of whether a method of expression was related to the likelihood of the infant in a neonatal unit transferring to breastfeeding at an earlier or later time. One study found no difference in infant breastfeeding at discharge related to method of milk expression (Boo 2001) whereas Burton 2013 reports descriptively that the infants of mothers using the small electric pump were more likely to be breastfeeding at discharge from the neonatal unit then those using a large electric pump. Ahmed 2008 found an education programme for mothers who were expressing had a six-fold effect on likelihood of the infant breastfeeding at discharge from the neonatal unit. Some mothers may provide milk for their preterm infant but not wish to put their baby to the breast at any time, or the condition of the infant may make feeding at the breast unlikely. Though the WHO recommendation is to exclusively breastfeed for the first six months, this may not be what mothers intend to do even if adequate support is available. Any study examining this outcome measure would need to be specifically designed to do so, taking into account maternal intentions.

Many of the studies reviewed included outcomes related to the quantity of milk obtained and compared hand expression with pumps or between pumps. The studies tended to use different measures and few compared the same pumps, which limited drawing conclusions. The time period over which expression or pumping occurs should be noted when comparing findings as the included studies measured from a single expression from one breast to 60 days (Table 3). Slusher 2007 reports a significant mean difference in total volume during a six-day period during the first two weeks after birth of 161 mL, 212 mL and 373 mL depending on method. If these amounts were divided by six days and by the number of feeds per day, the differences between methods might not be clinically significant, whereas the 35 mL higher volume in a single expression when using a relaxation tape, if repeated in each expression, might be more clinically significant (Feher 1989), as would be the up to 500 mL higher amount on day 14 found with relaxation techniques (Keith 2012).

In three studies that used the same brand and model of a large electric pump (Medela Lactina) with double collection set compared to hand expression the results were inconsistent. The mean difference (2.10 mL) between the volumes obtained by hand expression or the electric pump 12 to 36 hours after birth was not statistically significant (Flaherman 2012). Though the total mean volume over six days within a two-week period was highest with an electric pump; on day one the mean volume was highest with hand expression (Slusher 2007). No significant difference was shown between the quantities of milk obtained in the other study measured on day five (Pessoto 2010). Lack of clear results may relate to the wide individual variation between participants and the most effective method differs depending on the days since birth or across the stage of expression. Pessoto 2010 reported on day five after birth a range of 0 to 1405 mL (mean 149 to 373) depending on method; Slusher 2007 reported on day five (third day of pumping) a range from 0 to 1095 mL (mean 190 to 368) depending on method.

Time taken to obtain milk was reported in some studies as an indicator of the effectiveness of the pump. One study of two small electric pumps and a large electric pump found significant mean difference of two to six minutes per session between the pumps (Francis 2008), which could accumulate to 12 to 36 minutes for a mother pumping six times per day, with another trial finding sequential pumping took 3.5 hours per week less than simultaneous pumping for the same volume of milk (Groh-Wargo 1995), which is approximately 30 minutes per day difference, and may influence some mothers in their choice of pump. Two other studies comparing two pumps (Burton 2013) and four pumps (Bernabe-Garcia 2012) found no significant time difference (none of the pumps were the same brand). Most studies instructed mothers to continue pumping until the milk flow slowed or ceased, however, a maximum duration was set in some studies, whereas other studies

only reported the amount obtained at time points (Table 3). The frequency of pumping or expressing recommended in the included studies ranged from a minimum of four times per day to 12 times per day. However, the recommendation made may not have been the frequency achieved, which (where reported) ranged from approximate means of less than three to more than six expressions per day (Table 5).

Protein concentration varied between the four methods tested, though not in a consistent direction and there was no significant difference found in energy content (kcal/L) between milk obtained by three methods. Only one trial of pumps that provided data showed a significant difference related to fat content (Hopkinson 2009).

The plasma prolactin response was found to be higher for a large electric pump than in either hand expression, a manual pump or a battery pump ($P < 0.05$) (Zinaman 1992) and in a novel pump compared to a standard pump ($P = 0.018$) (Hopkinson 2009) (all different brand pumps), though not significantly different for sequential versus simultaneous pumping (Groh-Wargo 1995).

No significant difference was found in oxytocin response between pumps tested in the studies or between simultaneous and sequential pumping.

No study reported data on economic outcomes in a way that could be analysed in this review. The results of this review indicated no significant difference was found between effectiveness of the lower-cost pumps tested or hand expression (measured as volume obtained) in some studies (Bernabe-Garcia 2012; Boutte 1985; Burton 2013; Fewtrell 2001a; Fewtrell 2001b; Flaherman 2012; Hopkinson 2009; Pessoto 2010), though not in all studies (Francis 2008; Garza 1982; Slusher 2007; Zinaman 1992). Findings of our review indicate there are low-cost techniques available to all mothers that may increase milk volume obtained.

Breastfeeding and the provision of human milk for human babies is a biologically normal activity and thus is different from many activities investigated by randomised controlled trials (RCTs). In trials comparing interventions, it is important to include, or at least refer to, the outcomes in the normal situation so as to avoid comparing only one abnormal situation with another abnormal situation, and implying that milk expression or pumping is synonymous with breastfeeding.

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

The small sample sizes (n = 9 to 280) and very wide standard deviations mean the findings may not be applicable to other women or other settings. It must be noted that within the categories of pump type, such as manual or electric, not all the pumps were the same brand or worked in a similar way. A different pump, though within the same category, might have different outcomes, or the same brand may have changed over the years. The included studies were published between 1982 and 2013. The procedure in which the method was used may have varied between studies as there were inconsistent results for the one analysis in which the same make of pump was used in three different settings (Analysis 5.4). Three studies (Jones 2001; Stellwagen 2010; Stutte 1988) included breast massage or hand expression with pumping as a stated aspect of their trial, whereas Pessoto 2010 taught all mothers to massage their breasts as a routine part of milk expression, independent of which pump or hand expression group they were allocated to.

The majority of the participants were mothers of infants in neonatal units (n = 1293 women, 21 studies), plus healthy infants at home (n = 689 women, 12 studies) and a mix (n = 16, one study). Some findings such as sodium levels are particularly relevant to preterm infants, though may be of limited relevance to mothers of healthy full term infants. Findings related to expensive large electric pumps may be of limited use in a resource-poor setting, and not all results have clinical significance though may be very relevant to a researcher. Each situation needs to consider this review in relation to their specific situation.

Some studies reported on duration of breastfeeding related to method used. Duration was not an outcome included in this review as there are many variables. Mothers may have different reasons for expressing or pumping milk, including expressing a small amount to assist the baby to attach to the breast, expressing if overfull and uncomfortable, short separations from a baby otherwise feeding at the breast or expressing larger quantities of milk long term for a baby who cannot feed at the breast. None of the studies addressed whether the mother's own needs for milk expression were met.

Quality of the evidence

This review now includes 34 trials involving 1998 women that took place in 11 countries under a variety of circumstances. Seventeen of the studies provided data that could be analysed in RevMan contributing to both of the primary outcomes and five of the six secondary outcomes. Different designs, interventions, measurements and reported outcomes used in the studies did not allow for meta-analysis.

We assessed each of the included studies for the risk of bias and the quality of the evidence provided by the authors of this review. Overall, the main concerns noted were the lack of information concerning the blinding of the assessors (objectivity in the management and assessment of the data), how incomplete data were addressed (biasing the measure of effectiveness) and if the studies were free of other potential biases. It would not be possible to blind participants and personnel for most of the interventions as these involved comparing hand expression to a pump, or comparing two or more different types of pumps, or techniques such as breast massage.

Examining methods of milk expression has many challenges, and some could be addressed through greater attention to study design

details. Where cross-over designs were used, results were not always reported as paired data that would take into account individual variations, or examining order of use of each method, which limited the conclusions that could be drawn from the results.
Unintentional additions or omissions to the care of the participants may have effects on the outcomes, such as providing a bra to assist hands-free pumping (Hopkinson 2009) to some of the participants, or fewer staff available to carry out the intervention than needed (Rasmussen 2011). In the absence of a validated tool for the assessment of maternal satisfaction, various authors have devised their own rather disparate methods of assessment.
Many trialists were willing to discuss their work and provide clarification or further data, however some gaps remained.

Potential biases in the review process

In order to reduce publication and language bias, we made requests widely through lactation networks and through equipment manufacturers, seeking any additional studies to those found by literature searching that yielded some contacts with researchers and additional studies. We obtained translations of possible studies; however, the non-English language work may be under-represented though requests were made to all world regions. The amount of research related to milk expression appears to have increased in recent years, with hand expression being included more as well as ongoing research on vacuum patterns of large electric pumps. Additional data were willingly provided and discussed by some trialists; we were unable to find some trialists; and some trialists did not reply to queries, which resulted in some data not being used as they were not available in a format suitable for analysis. Three authors from differing areas of expertise worked on all aspects of this review which encouraged discussion, a broader viewpoint and provided a step to minimise bias.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

There are few (if any) other systematic reviews of methods of milk expression. Published descriptive reviews may favour healthcare systems and practices where large electric pumps are widely available and considered the norm. This affects the choice of research outcomes where high volume in the shortest time is considered the ideal outcome with some of the research funded by manufacturers to develop or test their equipment. Our analysis of the data from one included study (Boo 2001) differed markedly from the conclusions of the trialists; however, their conclusion has been frequently referred to in other material stating that milk expressed by pump was at higher likelihood of contamination, for which we found no evidence in two studies reviewed. The differences in sodium level found in the included data of Pessoto 2010 was also found in the cross-over study with mothers of preterm infants by Lang 1994 who discusses the possible underlying physical and physiological differences between extraction by compression and by suction as well as mammary cell permeability at various stages of lactation.
Evidence examined in this update does not substantially change the conclusions of the original 2008 version of this review or the 2011 update, though this update provides some additional conclusions related to the positive effect of basic techniques such as relaxation, warming of the breast, breast massage and early initiation of expressing/pumping.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

A baby feeding at the breast is the biological norm. Expression of milk is a complex intervention of a very individual nature. Results from individual trials may not be generalisable to other cultures and situations. The results of this updated review suggest that the most suitable method of milk expression may depend on the time since birth, the purpose of expression and the individual mother. Hand expression may be more suitable in the first few days to initiate milk supply, and particularly where the constituents of the milk may be important. A large electric pump may be useful if quantity is the main goal, though pumping may have a higher risk of injury for the mother than hand expression. If a large electric pump is too costly, manual pumps may be as effective as regards volume obtained once milk supply is established. Hand expression or breast massage combined with pumping may be beneficial. The finding of significantly higher sodium content in hand expressed milk indicates a need to take into account the method of obtaining milk when determining if there is a need for sodium supplementation of the preterm infant. Sodium concentration relates to milk volume, and aiming for high volumes with mechanical pumping may result in lower quality of some nutrients.

Results of this review highlight the importance of considering more than the method or the type of pump in isolation, and looking broader to include early initiation of expressing and assisting mothers to gain knowledge and skills to express their milk. Practitioners should consider using some means to help women consciously relax to increase the volume of milk obtained when pumping, as two studies showed a significant increase. From the information available in the included studies, important aspects that positively influenced mothers' satisfaction in their use of pumps included ease of assembly, ease of use and comfort. An understanding of individuals' preferences regarding activities during pump usage is required when choosing between simultaneous versus sequential breast pumping, as is the mother's subjective views on these techniques. We found no evidence that a particular type of pump was associated with a higher level of milk contamination,

infant sepsis or transfer to feeding at the breast. Methodological shortcomings of some trials, especially small sample sizes and very large standard deviations, the small number of studies reviewed for each outcome, and the diversity in the nature, duration and frequency of the interventions argue caution in applying these results beyond the specific equipment tested in the specific settings. Publications on methods and types of pumps should not be taken to mean that pumping milk is a normal part of breastfeeding; it is an intervention that should be justified before being recommended to an individual mother by a practitioner.

Implications for research

Findings from this review suggest that future research comparing methods of milk expression and pumping examine the reasons why women express milk and the contexts in which they do so, as well as the techniques, regimens and equipment used, which may require different study designs.

Common measurement points such as day seven, day 21, and day 42 would aid in comparisons of outcomes, as would as would consideration of co-interventions such as staff knowledge and support, staffing levels and maternal education, as well as mother's access to her baby, rest, food and fluids. All trials should include economic analyses of the relative costs and benefits of a milk expression method.

Well-designed and well-reported studies are needed. Cross-over studies have the potential to examine how an individual mother responds to two or more methods of milk expression. Much of the data from of the cross-over studies could not be used in the analysis as they were not reported as between-mother difference or pair analysis, thus negating the value in using a cross-over design. This problem occurred both in small studies carried out by an individual in their own setting and in funded studies carried out by researchers in academic units.

Fifteen of the 25 studies that evaluated pumps or products had support from the manufacturers. Independently funded research is needed, particularly to include methods such as hand expression and relaxation that do not have a commercial potential. There is a lack of data relating to how various methods and techniques of milk expression or pumping assist mothers to meet their own goals for milk expression, rather than goals set by the researchers. Research on mothers' views of effective methods is needed.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Mary Renfrew and Felicia McCormick co-authored the original version of this review (2008). The Department of Health Promotion, National University of Ireland, Galway, facilitated the lead author to obtain a Cochrane Fellowship from the Health Research Board, Ireland for the original version.

We are grateful to the study authors and their colleagues who provided further information: B Bowles, A Ahmed, K Auerbach, M Bernabe-Garcia, N Boo, M Fewtrell, V Flaherman, J Francis, S Fujimoto, S Groh-Wargo, P Hill, J Hopkinson, V Hughes, D Keith, J Kent, S Lang, S Lewis, L Parker, M Pessoto, D Prime, K Rasmussen, C Scott, and T Slusher, and to those people who noticed the requests and directed us to additional studies and ways of contacting authors.

Thanks are also due to Sonja Henderson, Frances Kellie, and Leanne Jones, previous Managing Editor, current Managing Editor, and Associate Editor over the years of this review, and their colleagues in the Review Group office of the Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

As part of the pre-publication editorial process, this review has been commented on by three peers (an editor and two referees who are external to the editorial team), a member of the Pregnancy and Childbirth Group's international panel of consumers and the Group's Statistical Adviser.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

Ahmed 2008 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Ahmed A. Breastfeeding preterm infants: an educational program to support mothers of preterm infants in Cairo, Egypt. *Pediatric Nursing* 2008;**34**(2):125–38.

Auerbach 1990 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Auerbach KG. Sequential and simultaneous breast pumping: a comparison. *International Journal of Nursing Studies* 1990; **27**(3):257–65.

Bernabe-Garcia 2012 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Bernabe-Garcia M, Lopez-Alarcon M, Villegar R, Rodriguez-Cruz M, Jimenez-Galicia C. Usefulness of four manual breast pumps for mothers after preterm delivery in a developing country. Unpublished manuscript.
* Bernabe-Garcia M, Lopez-Alarcon M, Villegas-Silva R, Rodriguez-Cruz M, Jimenez-Galicia C. Effectiveness of four manual breast pumps for mothers after preterm delivery in a developing country. *Journal of the American College of Nutrition* 2012;**31**(1):63–9.

Boo 2001 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Boo N, Nordiah AJ, Alfizah H, Nor-Rohaini AH, Lim VK. Contamination of breast milk obtained by manual expression and breast pumps in mothers of very low birthweight infants. *ACP Journal Club* 2000;**132**(3):116.
* Boo NY, Nordiah AJ, Alfizah H, Nor-Rohaini AH, Lim

VK. Contamination of breast milk obtained by manual expression and breast pumps in mothers of very low birthweight infants. *Journal of Hospital Infection* 2001;**49** (4):274–81.

Boutte 1985 ***{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}***
Boutte CA, Garza C, Kennard-Fraley J, Stuff JE, O'Brian-Smith E. Comparison of hand and electric operated breast pumps. *Human Nutrition: Applied Nutrition* 1985;**39A**: 416–30.

Burton 2013 ***{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}***
* Burton P, Kennedy K, Ahluwalia J, Nicholl R, Lucas A, Fewtrell M. Randomized trial comparing the effectiveness of two electric breast pumps in the NICU. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2013;**29**(3):412–9.
Burton PM, Kennedy K, Lucas A, Ahluwalla J, Nicholl R, Fewtrell M. Breast pump design and milk production: a randomised control trial. American Academy of Pediatrics Annual Meeting; 2010 October 2-5; San Francisco, California, USA. 2010.
Fewtrell M. Randomised trial comparing the efficacy of the ISIS Duo iQ electric breast pump and the Medela Symphony electric breast pump in mothers expressing breast milk for preterm infants. ClinicalTrials.gov (http://clinicaltrials.gov/) [(accessed July 2010] 2009.

Costa 1989 ***{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}***
Costa KM. A comparison of colony counts of breast milk using two methods of breast cleansing. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic and Neonatal Nursing* 1989;**18**:231–6.

De Carvalho 1985 ***{published data only}***
De Carvalho M, Anderson DM, Giangreco A, Pittard WB. Frequency of milk expression and milk production by mothers of nonnursing premature neonates. *American Journal of Diseases of Children* 1985;**139**:483–5.

Feher 1989 ***{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}***
Feher S, Berger L, Johnson J, Wilde J. Increasing breast milk production for premature infants with a relaxation/imagery audiotape. *Pediatrics* 1989;**83**(1):57–60.

Fewtrell 2001a ***{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}***
Fewtrell M, Lucas P, Collier S, Lucas A. Randomized study comparing the efficacy of a novel manual breast pump with a mini-electric breast pump in mothers of term infants. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2001;**17**(2):126–31.

Fewtrell 2001b ***{published and unpublished data}***
Fewtrell MS, Lucas P, Collier S, Singhal A, Ahluwalia JS, Lucas A. Randomized trial comparing the efficacy of a novel manual breast pump with a standard electric breast pump in mothers who delivered preterm infants. *Pediatrics* 2001; **107**(6):1291–7.

Flaherman 2012 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Flaherman VJ, Gay B, Scott C, Aby J, Stewart AL, Lee KA. Development of the breast milk expression experience measure. *Maternal & Child Nutrition* 2013;**9**:425–30. [DOI: 10.1111/j.1740-8709.2011.00390.x]
* Flaherman VJ, Gay B, Scott C, Avins A, Lee KA, Newman TB. Randomised trial comparing hand expression with breast pumping for mothers of term newborns feeding poorly. *Archives of Disease in Childhood. Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2012;**97**(1):F18–F23.
Flaherman VJ, Scott C, Gay B, Lee K, Newman TB. Randomized trial of electric breast pump use vs. hand expression in mothers of infants feeding poorly at 12-36 hours. Pediatric Academic Societies' Annual Meeting; 2010 May 1-4; Vancouver, Canada. 2010.

Francis 2008 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Francis J. Maternal/infant lactation characteristics (MILC) study: a comparison of single electric pumping devices. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2008;**24**(1):107.
* Francis J, Bertz P, Wagoner C. The maternal/infant lactation characteristics (MILC) study: evaluation of three single electric pumping devices. Unpublished paper provided by study author J Francis.

Garza 1982 ***{published data only}***
Garza C, Johnson CA, Harrist R, Nichols BL. Effects of methods of collection and storage on nutrients in human milk. *Early Human Development* 1982;**6**:295–303.

Groh-Wargo 1995 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Groh-Wargo S, Toth A, Mahoney K, Simonian S, Wasser T, Rose S. The utility of a bilateral breast pumping system for mothers of premature infants. *Neonatal Network* 1995;**14**: 31–6.

Hayes 2008 ***{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}***
Hayes DK, Prince CB, Espinueva V, Fuddy LJ, Li R, Grummer-Strawn LM. Comparison of manual and electric breast pumps among WIC women returning to work or school in Hawaii. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2008;**3**(1):3–10.

Hill 1999 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Hill PD, Aldag JC, Chatterton RT. Breastfeeding experience and milk weight in lactating mothers pumping for preterm infants. *Birth* 1999;**26**(4):233–8.
* Hill PD, Aldag JC, Chatterton RT. Effects of pumping style on milk production in mothers of non-nursing preterm infants. *Journal of Human Lactation* 1999;**15**(3):209–16.
Hill PD, Aldag JC, Chatterton RT. Initiation and frequency of pumping and milk production in mothers of non-nursing preterm infants. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2001;**17**(1): 9–13.
Hill PD, Aldag JC, Chatterton RT. Initiation of pumping and milk weight in mothers of non-nursing preterm infants. *Integrating Population Outcomes, Biological Mechanisms and Research Methods in the Study of Human Milk and Lactation.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers, 2005: 267–9.
Hill PD, Aldag JC, Chatterton RT. The effect of sequential and simultaneous breast pumping on milk volume and prolactin levels: a pilot study. *Journal of Human Lactation* 1996;**12**(3):193–9.

Hopkinson 2009 ***{published and unpublished data}***
Hopkinson J, Heird W. Maternal response to two electric breast pumps. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2009;**4**(1):17–23.

Jones 2001 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Jones E, Dimmock PW, Spencer SA. A randomised controlled trial to compare methods of milk expression after preterm delivery. *Archives of Disease in Childhood Fetal & Neonatal Edition* 2001;**85**(2):F91–F95.

Keith 2012 *{published and unpublished data}*
Keith DR, Weaver BS, Vogel RL. The effect of music-based listening interventions on the volume, fat content, and caloric content of breast milk-produced by mothers of premature and critically ill infants. *Advances in Neonatal Care* 2012;**12**(2):112–9.

Meier 2008 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Engstrom JL, Meier PP, Jegier B, Motykowski JE, Zuleger JL. Comparison of milk output from the right and left breasts during simultaneous pumping in mothers of very low birthweight infants. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2007;**2**(2): 83–91.
Jegier BJ, Meier P, Angstrom JL, McBride T. The initial maternal cost of providing 100mL of human milk for very low birth weight infants in the neonatal intensive care unit. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2010;**5**(2):71–7.
* Meier PP, Engstrom JL, Hurst NM, Ackerman B, Allen M, Motykowski JE, et al. A comparison of the efficiency, efficacy, comfort, and convenience of two hospital-grade electric breast pumps for mothers of very low birthweight infants. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2008;**3**(3):141–50.
Meier PP, Hurst N, Rodriguez N, Ackerman B, Howard K, Allen M, et al. Comfort and effectiveness of the Symphony breast pump for mothers of preterm infants; comparison of three suction pumps. *Advances in Experimental Medicine and Biology* 2004;**554**:321–3.

Meier 2012 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Meier PP, Engstrom JL, Janes JE, Jegier BJ, Loera F. Breast pump suction patterns that mimic the human infant during breastfeeding: greater milk output in less time spent pumping for breast pump-dependent mothers with premature infants. *Journal of Perinatology* 2012;**32**(2): 103–10.

Mersmann 1994 *{unpublished data only}*
Mersmann, C A. Therapeutic touch and milk letdown in mothers of non-nursing preterm infants. PhD Thesis, New York University. New York: New York University, 1993.

Parker 2012 *{published and unpublished data}*
Parker L, Sullivan S, Krueger C. Effect of early breastmilk expression on milk volume and timing of lactogenesis stage II among mothers of very low birth weight infants: a pilot study. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2010;**5**(6):327.
* Parker LA, Sullivan S, Krueger C, Kelechi T, Mueller M. Effect of early breast milk expression on milk volume and timing of lactogenesis stage II among mothers of very low birth weight infants: A pilot study. *Journal of Perinatology* 2012;**32**(3):205–9.

Paul 1996 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Paul VK, Singh M, Deorari AK, Pacheco J, Teneja U. Manual and pump methods of expression of breast milk. *Indian Journal of Pediatrics* 1996;**63**:87–92.

Pessoto 2010 *{published and unpublished data}*
Pessoto MA, Marba STM. Is a high quality expressed breast milk, according to expression method, possible for the premature baby in a third world country?. Pediatric Academic Societies' 2010 Annual Meeting; 2010 May 1-4; Vancouver, Canada. 2010.

Pittard 1991 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
* Pittard WB, Geddes KM, Brown S, Hulsey TC. Bacterial contamination of human milk: container type and method of expression. *American Journal of Perinatology* 1991;**8**(1): 25–7.
Pittard WB, Geddes KM, Brown S, Mintz S, Hulsey TC. Bacterial contamination of human milk. *Pediatric Research* 1989;**25**:122A.

Prime 2012 *{published and unpublished data}*
Prime DK, Garbin CP, Hartmann PE, Kent JC. A comparison of simultaneous and sequential breast expression in women. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2010;**26**(4):433.
* Prime DK, Garbin CP, Hartmann PE, Kent JC. Simultaneous breast expression in breastfeeding women is more efcacious than sequential breast expression. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2012;**7**(6):442–7.

Rasmussen 2011 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Rasmussen K, Dieterich C, Zelek S, Altabet J, Kjolhede C. Interventions to increase the duration of breastfeeding in obese mothers: the Bassett Improving Breastfeeding Study. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2011;**6**(2):69–75.

Slusher 2007 *{published and unpublished data}*
* Slusher T, Slusher IL, Biomdo M, Bode-Thomas F, Curtis BA, Meier PP. Electric breast pump use increases maternal milk volume in African nurseries. *Journal of Tropical Pediatrics* 2007;**53**(2):125–30.
Slusher TM, Slusher IL, Biomdo M, Bode-Thomas F, Redd BC, Meier PP. Electric breast pump use increases maternal milk volume and decreases time to onset of adequate maternal milk volume in African nurseries. *Pediatric Research* 2004;**55 Suppl**:32.

Stellwagen 2010 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Chan CS, Stellwagen LM, Vaucher YE, Montminy TD, Kim JH. Hand expression combined with pumping does not change the nutrient content of human milk from mothers of very low birthweight infants. Pediatric Academic Societies' 2010 Annual Meeting; 2010 May 1-4; Vancouver, Canada. 2010.
* Stellwagen LM, Vaucher YE, Chan CS, Kim JH. Does hand expression improve human milk production in pump dependent mothers of VLBW infants?. Pediatric Academic Societies' 2010 Annual Meeting; 2010 May 1-4; Vancouver, Canada. 2010.

Stutte 1988 *{published and unpublished data}*
Stutte PC, Bowles BC, Morman GY. The effects of breast massage on volume and fat content of human milk. *Genesis* 1988;**10**(2):22–5.

Yiğ it 2012 *{published data only}*
Yigit F, Cigdem Z, Temizsoy E, Cingi ME, Korel O, Yildirim E, et al. Does warming the breasts affect the amount of breastmilk production?. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2012;**7**(6):487–8.

Zinaman 1992 *{published and unpublished data}*
Zinaman MJ, Hughes V, Queenan JT, Labbok MH, Albertson B. Acute prolactin and oxytocin responses and milk yield to infant suckling and artificial methods of expression in lactating women. *Pediatrics* 1992;**89**(3): 437–40.

References to studies excluded from this review

Chapman 2001 *{published data only}*
Chapman DJ, Young S, Ferris AM, Perez-Escamilla R. Impact of breast pumping on lactogenesis stage II after cesarean delivery: a randomized clinical trial. *Pediatrics* 2001;**107**:E94.

Chong 2007 *{published and unpublished data}*
Chong YS. Early and regular breast milk expression to help establish lactation after delivery: a randomized controlled trial. Current Controlled Trials (http://controlled-trials.com) (accessed 15.02.2007) 2007.

Fewtrell 2006 *{published data only}*
Fewtrell M, Loh K, Blake D, Ridout D, Hawdon J. Randomised double blind trial of oxytocin in nasal spray in mothers expressing breast milk for preterm infants. *Archives of Diseases of Childhood Fetal Neonatal Edition* 2006;**91**(3): F169–F174.

Flores-Huerta 1995 *{published data only}*
Flores-Huerta S, Sanchez-Hidalgo VM, Matute G, Contreras-Lemus J, Villalpando S. Volume and composition comparison of human foremilk extracted with manual or electrical pump [Comparacion del volumen y composicion del calostro extraido con una bomba manual o electrica]. *Boletin Medico del Hospital Infantil de Mexico* 1995;**52**(8): 465–70.

Forster 2011 *{published data only}*
Forster DA, McEgan K, Ford R, Moorhead A, Opie G, Walker S, et al. Diabetes and antenatal milk expressing: a pilot project to inform the development of a randomised controlled trial. *Midwifery* 2011;**27**(2):209–14.

Fujimoto 2006 *{published and unpublished data}*
Fujimoto S, Yokoo K, Nakagomi S, Murakami M. Mothers' experiences of expressing breast milk for neonates in the NICU - difference between hand and electric breast pump expression. *Journal of Health Sciences, Hiroshima University* 2006;**6**(1):65–70.

Green 1982 *{published data only}*
Green D, Moye L, Schreiner RL, Lemons JA. The relative efficacy of four methods of human milk expression. *Early Human Development* 1982;**6**(2):153–9.

Junior 2008 *{published data only}*
Junior WS, Martinez FE. Effect of intervention on the rates of breastfeeding of very low birth weight newborns. *Neonatal Intensive Care* 2008;**21**(2):37–41.

Kent 2003 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Kent JC, Ramsey DT, Doherty D, Larsson M, Hartmann PE. Responses of breasts to different stimulation patterns of an electric pump. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2003;**19**(2): 179–86.

Kent 2008 *{published and unpublished data}*
Kent JC, Mitoulas LR, Cregan MD, Geddes DT, Larsson M, Doherty DA, et al. Importance of vacuum for breastmilk expression. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2008;**2**(1):11–9.

Lang 1994 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Lang S, Lawrence CJ, Orme RL. Sodium in hand and pump expressed human breast milk. *Early Human Development* 1994;**38**(2):131–8.

Lewis 2005 *{unpublished data only}*
Lewis SL. *Effect of electric breast pump on breastfeeding duration and exclusivity in working Utah Woman, Infants and Children Program participants [dissertation]*. Utah: College of Health, University of Utah, 2005.

Mennella 2010a *{published data only}*
Mennella JA, Pepino MY. Breast pumping and lactational state exert differential effects on ethanol pharmacokinetics. *Alcohol* 2010;**44**(2):141–8.

Mennella 2010b *{published data only}*
Mennella JA, Pepino MY. Breastfeeding and prolactin levels in lactating women with a family history of alcoholism. *Pediatrics* 2010;**125**(5):e1162–e1170.

Morton 2009 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
* Morton J, Hall JY, Wong RJ, Thairu L, Benitz WE, Rhine WD. Combining hand techniques with electric pumping increases milk production in mothers of preterm infants. *Journal of Perinatology* 2009;**29**:757–64.
Morton J, Wong RJ, Hall JY, Pang WW, Lai C, Hartmann P, et al. Combining hand techniques with electric pumping increases the caloric content of milk in mothers of preterm infants. *Journal of Perinatology* 2012;**32**:791–6.

Ohyama 2010 *{published data only}*
* Ohyama M, Watabe H, Hayasaka Y. Manual expression and electric breast pumping in the first 48 h after delivery. Pediatrics International: Official Journal of the Japan Pediatric Society 2010; Vol. 52, issue 1:39–43.
Ohyama M, Watabe H, Hayasaka Y. Which is more effective, manual- or electric-expression in the first 48 hours after delivery in a setting of mother-infant separation? Preliminary report. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2007;**2**(3):179.

Pepino 2008 *{published data only}*
Pepino MY, Mennella JA. Effects of breast pumping on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of ethanol during lactation. *Clinical Pharmacology and Therapeutics* 2008;**84** (6):710–4.

Slusher 2012 *{published data only}*
Slusher TM, Slusher IL, Keating EM, Curtis BA, Smith EA, Orodriyo E, et al. Comparison of maternal milk (breastmilk) expression methods in an African nursery. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2012;**7**(2):107–11.

Thompson 1997 *{published data only}*
Thompson N, Pickler RH, Munro C, Shotwell J. Contamination in expressed breast milk following breast cleansing. *Journal of Human Lactation* 1997;**13**(2):127–30.

Waller 1946 *{published data only}*
Waller H. The early failure of breast feeding. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 1946;**21**:1–12.

Williams 1985 *{published data only}*
Williams AF, Akinkugbe FM, Baum JD. A comparison of two methods of milk sampling for calculating the fat intake of breast-fed babies. *Human Nutrition. Clinical Nutrition* 1985;**39**:193–202.

Zhen 1990 *{published and unpublished data}*
Zhen H, Qian A. Breast massage to promote milk secretion for pregnant and parturient women. *Chinese Journal of Nursing* 1990;**25**(9):454–5.

References to studies awaiting assessment

Alekseev 1998 *{published data only (unpublished sought but not used)}*
Alekseev NP, Ilyin VI, Yaroslavski VK, Gaidukov SN, Tikhonova TK, Specivcev YA, et al. Compression stimuli increase the efficacy of breast pump function. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology* 1998;**7**:131–9.

Heon 2011 *{published data only}*
Heon M. *[Nursing interventions related to breastfeeding in preterm infants]. Interventions infirmieres relatives a l'allaitement maternel de nouveau-nes prematures [thesis]*. Montreal: University of Montreal, 2011.

Yu 2014 *{unpublished data only}*
Yu R. Philips AVENT Relaxation Study. http://www.healthcare.philips.com/pwc˙hc/main/shared/Assets/Documents/avent/Relaxation˙Study˙Summary˙final.pdf (accessed May 12 2014).

References to ongoing studies

Dollberg 2013 *{published data only}*
Dollberg S. Milk volume production in mothers of preterm infants: electric pumping modalities. ClinicalTrials.gov (http://clinicaltrials.gov/) [accessed 5 August 2013] 2013.

Sisk 2013 *{published data only}*
Sisk PM, Showalter M. Lactation education study in mothers of very low birth weight infants. ClinicalTrials.gov (http://clinicaltrials.gov/) [accessed 05 May 2013] 2013.

Additional references

AAP 2012
American Academy of Pediatrics. Policy Statement: breastfeeding and the use of human milk. *Pediatrics* 2012; **129**:e827–e841.

Acuña-Muga L 2014
Acuña-Muga J, Ureta-Velasco N, de la Cruz-Bértolo J, Ballesteros-López R, Sánchez-Martínez R, Miranda-Casabona E, et al. Volume of milk obtained in relation to location and circumstances of expression in mothers of very low birth weight infants. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2014; **30**:41–6.

Arnold 1990
Arnold L. Clinical uses of donor milk. *Journal of Human Lactation* 1990;**6**:132–3.

Asquith 1984
Asquith MT, Pedrotti PW, Harrod JR, Stevenson DK, Sunshine P. The bacterial content of breast milk after the early initiation of expression using a standard technique. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition.* 1984;**3** (1):104–7.

Auerbach 1981
Auerbach KG, Avery JL. Induced lactation. A study of adoptive nursing by 240 women. *American Journal of Diseases of Children.* 1981;**135**(4):340–3.

Bachrach 2003
Bachrach V, Schwarz E, Bachrach L. Breastfeeding and the risk of hospitalization for respiratory disease in infancy: a meta-analysis. *Archives of Pediatric and Adolescent Medicine* 2003;**157**:237–43.

Ball 1999
Ball T, Wright A. Health care cost of formula-feeding in the first year of life. *Pediatrics* 1999;**103**:870–6.

Bartick 2010
Bartick M, Reinhold A. The burden of suboptimal breastfeeding in the United States: a pediatric cost analysis. *Pediatrics* 2010;**125**(5):1048–56.

Bier 2002
Bier J, Oliver T, Ferguson A, Vohr B. Human milk improves cognitive and motor development of premature infants during infancy. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2002;**18**: 361–7.

Biervliet 2001
Biervliet FP, Maguiness SD, Hay DM, Killick SR, Atkin SL. Induction of lactation in the intended mother of a surrogate pregnancy: case report. *Human Reproduction* 2001;**16**(3): 581–3.

Binns 2006
Binns CW, Win NN, Zheo Y, Scott JA. Trends in the expression of breastmilk 1993-2003. *Breastfeeding Review* 2006;**14**(3):5–9.

Black 2013
Black RE, Victora CG, Walker SP, Bhutta, ZA, Christian, P, de Onis M, et al. Maternal and child under nutrition and overweight in low-income and middle-income countries. *Lancet* 2013;**382**:427–51.

Blaymore 2002
Blaymore Bier J, Oliver T, Ferguson A, Vohr B. Human milk reduces outpatient upper respiratory symptoms in premature infants during their first year of life. *Journal of Perinatology* 2002;**22**:354–9.

Blenkharn 1989
Blenkharn JI. Infection risks from electrically operated breast pumps. *Journal of Hospital Infection.* 1989;**13**(1): 27–31.

BLISS 2008
BLISS. *Breastfeeding or Expressing for a Sick or Premature Baby: An Overview of 500 Women's Experiences*. London: BLISS, 2008.

Brown 2005
Brown SL, Bright RA, Dwyer DE, Foxman B. Breast pump adverse events: reports to the Food and Drug Administration. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2005;**21**(2): 169–74.

Buchko 1994
Buchko B, Pugh L, Bishop B, Cochran J, Smith L, Lerew D. Comfort measures in breastfeeding, primiparous women. *Journal of Obstetric, Gynecologic and Neonatal Nursing* 1994; **23**(1):46–52.

Buckley 2009
Buckley K. A double-edged sword: lactation consultants' perceptions of the impact of breast pumps on the practice of breastfeeding. *Journal of Perinatal Education* 2009;**18**(2): 13–22.

CDC 2007
Division of Nutrition, Physical Activity. Does breastfeeding reduce the risk of pediatric overweight. *Research to Practice Series*. Atlanta: Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2007:1–8.

Chen 2004
Chen A, Rogan W. Breastfeeding and the risk of postneonatal death in the United States. *Pediatrics* 2004; **113**(5):e435–9.

Clemons 2010
Clemons SN, Amir LH. Breastfeeding women's experience of expressing: a descriptive study. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2010;**26**(3):258–65.

Cohen 1995
Cohen R, Mrtek MB, Mrtek RG. Comparison of maternal absenteeism and infant illness rates among breast-feeding and formula-feeding women in two corporations. *American Journal of Health Promotion* 1995;**10**:148–53.

COMA 1981
COMA. *The collection and storage of human milk; reports of a working party on human milk banks, panel on child nutrition. Reports on Health and Social Subjects Number 22*. London: Department of Health and Social Security Committee on Medical Aspects of Food Policy, 1981.

D'Amico 2004
D'Amico C, DiNardo C, Krystofiak S. Preventing contamination of breast pump kit attachments in the NICU. *MIDIRS* 2004;**14**(2):246–51.

Donovan 2005
Donovan TJ, Buchanan K. Medications for increasing milk supply in mothers expressing breastmilk for their hospitalised infants. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2005, Issue 4. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005544]

Duijts 2010
Duijts L, Jaddoe VW, Hofman A, Moll HA. Prolonged and exclusive breastfeeding reduces the risk of infectious diseases in infancy. *Pediatrics* 2010;**126**(1):e18–e25.

Egnell 1956
Egnell E. Mechanics of different methods of emptying the female breast. *Journal of the Swedish Medical Association* 1956;**40**:1–8.

Fein 2008
Fein SB, Grummer-Strawn LM, Raju TN. Infant feeding and care practices in the United States: results from the infant feeding practices Study II. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(Suppl 2):S25–S27.

Ferris 1984
Ferris AM, Jensen RG. Lipids in human milk: a review. 1: sampling, determination, and content. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition* 1984;**3**(1):108–22.

Fewtrell 2004
Fewtrell M. The long-term benefits of having been breast-fed. *Current Paediatrics* 2004;**14**(2):97–103.

Foda 2004
Foda MI, Kawashima T, Nakamura S, Kobayashi M, Oku T. Composition of milk obtained from unmassaged versus massaged breasts of lactating mothers. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition* 2004;**38**(5):484–7.

Furman 2002
Furman L, Minich N, Hack M. Correlates of lactation in mothers of very low birth weight infants. *Pediatrics* 2002; **109**(4):e57.

Gdalevich 2001
Gdalevich M, Mimouni D, Mimouni M. Breast-feeding and the risk of bronchial asthma in childhood: a systematic review with meta-analysis of prospective studies. *Journal of Pediatrics* 2001;**139**:261–6.

Geraghty 2005
Geraghty SR, Khoury JC, Kalkwarf HJ. Human milk pumping rates of mothers of singletons and mothers of multiples. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2005;**21**(4):413–20.

Geraghty 2012
Geraghty S, Davidson B, Tabangin M, Morrow A. Predictors of breastmilk expression by 1 month postpartum and influence on breastmilk feeding duration. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2012;**7**(2):112–7.

Gerstein 1994
Gerstein H. Cow's milk exposure and type 1 diabetes mellitus. A critical overview of the clinical literature. *Diabetes Care* 1994;**17**:13–9.

Hamosh 1984
Hamosh M, Berkow S, Bitman J, Freed G, Happ B, Jones JB, et al. Handling and storage of human milk specimens for research. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition* 1984;**3**(2):284–9.

Hartmann 1985
Hartmann PE, Rattigan S, Saint L, Supriyana O. Variation in the yield and composition of human milk. *Oxford Reviews of Reproductive Biology* 1985;**7**:118–67.

Higgins 2006
Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions 4.2.6 [updated

September 2006]. In: The Cochrane Library, Issue 4, 2006. Chichester, UK: John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Higgins 2011
Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org.

Hill 1996
Hill P, Aldag J, Chatterton R. The effect of sequential and simultaneous breast pumping on milk volume and prolactin levels: a pilot study. *Journal of Human Lactation* 1996;**12**(3):193–9.

Hills-Bonczyk 1993
Hills-Bonczyk SG, Avery MD, Savik K, Potter S, Duckett LJ. Women's experiences with combining breast-feeding and employment. *Journal of Nurse-Midwifery* 1993;**38**(5):257–66.

Hopkinson 1988
Hopkinson JM, Schanler RJ, Garza C. Milk production by mothers of premature infants. *Pediatrics* 1988;**81**(6):815–20.

Horta 2013a
Horta BL, Victora CG. *Long-term effects of breastfeeding: a systematic review*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2013.

Horta 2013b
Horta BL, Victora CG. *Short-term effects of breastfeeding: a systematic review on the benefits of breastfeeding on diarrhoea and pneumonia mortality*. Geneva: World Health Organization, 2013.

Howie 1990
Howie PW, Forsyth JS, Ogston SA, Clark A, Florey C. Protective effect of breast feeding against infection. *BMJ* 1990;**300**:11–6.

Hylander 1998
Hylander M, Strobino D, Dhanireddy R. Human milk feedings, and infection among very low birth weight infants. *Pediatrics* 1998;**102**:e38.

Ip 2007
Ip S, Chung M, Raman G, Chew P, Magula N, DeVine D, et al. *Breastfeeding and maternal and infant health outcomes in developed countries. Evidence Report/Technology Assessment number 153*. Rockville: Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, 2007.

Jegier 2010
Jegier BJ, Meier P, Angstrom JL, McBride T. The initial maternal cost of providing 100mL of human milk for very low birth weight infants in the neonatal intensive care unit. *Breastfeeding Medicine* 2010;**5**(2):71–7.

Johns 2013
Johns HM, Forster DA, Amir LH, McLachlan HL. Prevalence and outcomes of breast milk expressing in women with healthy term infants: a systematic review. *BMC Pregnancy and Childbirth* 2013;**13**:212.

Karimi 2013
Karimi M, Eslami Z, Shamsi F, Moradi J, Ahmadi AY, Baghianimoghadam B. The effect of educational intervention on decreasing mothers' expressed breast milk bacterial contamination whose infants are admitted to Neonatal Intensive Care Unit. *Journal of Research in Health Sciences* 2013;**13**(1):43–7.

Kramer 2008
Kramer MS, Aboud F, Mironova E, Vanilovich I, Platt RW, Matush L, et al. Breastfeeding and child cognitive development: new evidence from a large randomized trial. *Archives of General Psychiatry* 2008;**65**(5):578–84.

Labayen 2012
Labayen I, Ruiz JR, Ortega FB, Loit HM, Harro J, Villa I, et al. Exclusive breastfeeding duration and cardiorespiratory fitness in children and adolescents. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2012;**95**(2):498–505.

Labiner-Wolfe 2008
Labiner-Wolfe J, Fein SB, Shealy KR, Wang C. Prevalence of breast milk expression and associated factors. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(Suppl 2):S63–S68.

Lucas 1990
Lucas A, Cole T. Breast milk and neonatal necrotising enterocolitis. *Lancet* 1990;**336**:1519–23.

Marild 2004
Marild S, Hansson S, Jodal U, Oden A, Svedberg K. Protective effect of breastfeeding against urinary tract infection. *Acta Paediatrica Scandinavica* 2004;**93**:164–8.

McCrory 2011
McCrory C, Layte R. The effect of breastfeeding on children's educational test scores at nine years of age: results of an Irish cohort study. *Social Science and Medicine* 2011;**72**(9):1515–21.

McGuire 2003
McGuire W, Anthony MY. Donor human milk versus formula for preventing necrotising enterocolitis in preterm infants: systematic review. *Archives of Disease in Childhood. Fetal and Neonatal Edition* 2003;**88**(1):F11–F14.

Meserve 1982
Meserve Y. Management of postpartum breast engorgement in non-breastfeeding women by mechanical extraction of milk. *Journal of Nurse Midwifery* 1982;**27**:3–8.

Mitoulas 2002a
Mitoulas L, Lai C, Gurrin L, Larsson M, Hartmann P. Effect of vacuum profile on breast milk expression using an electric breast pump. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2002;**18**(4):353–60.

Mitoulas 2002b
Mitoulas LR, Lai CT, Gurrin LC, Larsson M, Hartmann PE. Efficacy of breast milk expression using an electric breast pump. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2002;**18**(4):344–52.

Newell 2004
Newell ML. *HIV transmission through breastfeeding:a review of available evidence*. Geneva: WHO/UNICEF/UNAIDS, 2004.

NICE 2006
NICE: National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. Postnatal care: national cost impact report CG37. http://guidance.nice.org.uk/page.aspx?o=345136 [accessed July 2006].

Nicholson 1985
Nicholson WL. Cracked nipples in breast feeding mothers: a randomised trial of three methods of management. *Nursing Mothers Association of Australia* 1985;**21**(4):7–10.

Owen 2008
Owen CG, Whincup PH, Kaye SJ. Does initial breastfeeding lead to lower blood cholesterol in adult life? A quantitative review of the evidence. *American Journal of Clinical Nutrition* 2008;**88**(2):305–14.

Paradise 1994
Paradise J, Elster B, Tan L. Evidence in infants with cleft palate that breast milk protects against otitis media. *Pediatrics* 1994;**94**:853–86.

Patel 2013
Patel AL, Johnson TJ, Engstrom JL, Fogg LF, Jegier BJ, Bigger HR, et al. Impact of early human milk on sepsis and health-care costs in very low birth weight infants. *Journal of Perinatology* 2013;**33**:514–9.

Pettit 1997
Pettit D, Forman M, Hanson R, Knowler W, Bennett P. Breastfeeding and the incidence of non-insulin-dependent diabetes mellitus in Pima Indians. *Lancet* 1997;**350**:166–8.

Picciano 1984
Picciano MF. What constitutes a representative human milk sample?. *Journal of Pediatric Gastroenterology and Nutrition* 1984;**3**(2):280–3.

Qi 2014
Qi Y, Zhang Y, Fein S, Wang C, Loyo-Berríos N. Maternal and beast pump factors associated with breast pump problems and injuries. *Journal of Human Lactation* 2014; **30**:62–72.

Quigley 2007
Quigley MA, Kelly YJ, Sacker A. Breastfeeding and hospitalization for diarrheal and respiratory infection in the United Kingdom Millennium Cohort Study. *Pediatrics* 2007;**119**:e837–e842.

RevMan 2003
The Cochrane Collaboration. Review Manager (RevMan). 4.2 for Windows. Oxford, England: The Cochrane Collaboration, 2003.

RevMan 2014
The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration. Review Manager (RevMan). 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.

Ryan 2013
Ryan K, Smith L, Alexander J. When baby's chronic illness and disability interfere with breastfeeding: women's emotional adjustment. *Midwifery* 2013;**29**(7):794–800.

Schanler 1999
Schanler RJ, Shulman RJ, Lau C. Feeding strategies for premature infants: beneficial outcomes of feeding fortified human milk versus preterm formula. *Pediatrics* 1999;**103** (6):1150–7.

Schwartz 2002
Schwartz K, D'Arcy H, Gillespie B, Bobo J, Longeway M, Foxman B. Factors associated with weaning in the first 3 months postpartum. *Journal of Family Practice* 2002;**51**: 439–44.

Spencer 1981
Spencer SA, Hull D. Fat content of expressed breast milk: a case for quality control. *BMJ Clinical Research Edition* 1981;**282**(6258):99–100.

Sponsel 1983
Sponsel WE. Simple and effective breast pump for nursing mothers. *BMJ Clinical Research Edition* 1983;**286**(6372): 1180–1.

Tengku 2012
Tengku ATI, Zaharah S, Rohana J, Wan MWM, Nik NNM. Breast milk expression among formally employed women in urban and rural Malaysia: a qualitative study. *International Breastfeeding Journal* 2012;**7**:11.

Upadhyay 2004
Upadhyay A, Aggarwal R, Narayan S, Joshi M, Paul VK, Deorari A. Analgesic effect of expressed breast milk in procedural pain in term neonates: a randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blind trial. *Acta Paediatrica Scandinavica* 2004;**93**(4):518–22.

Victora 1987
Victora C, Smith P, Vaughn J, Nobre L, Lombardi C, Teixeira A, et al. Evidence for protection by breastfeeding against infant deaths from infectious diseases in Brazil. *Lancet* 1987;**1**:319–21.

Wennergren 1985
Wennergren M, Wiqvist N, Wennergren G. Manual breast pumps promote successful breast feeding. *Acta Obstetricia et Gynecologica Scandinavica* 1985;**64**(8):673–5.

WHO 2002
WHO. *Global strategy on infant and young child feeding. Executive Board paper. Report No.:EB 109/12.* Geneva: WHO, 2002.

WHO/UNICEF 1989
WHO/UNICEF. *Protecting, promoting and supporting breastfeeding: the special role of the maternity services.* Geneva: WHO, 1989.

Wilde 1995
Wilde CJ, Prentice A, Peaker M. Breastfeeding: matching supply with demand in human lactation. *Proceedings of the Nutrition Society* 1995;**54**:401–6.

Williams 1989
Williams J, Auerbach KG, Jacobi A. Lateral epicondylitis (tennis elbow) in breastfeeding mothers. *Clinical Pediatrics* 1989;**28**:42–3.

Win 2006

Win NN, Binns CW, Zheo Y, Scott JA, Oddy WH. Breastfeeding duration in mothers who express breast milk: a cohort study. *International Breastfeeding Journal* 2006;**1**: 28.

Zoppou 1997

Zoppou C, Barry SI, Mercer GN. Comparing breastfeeding and breast pumps using a computer model. *Journal of Human Lactation* 1997;**13**(3):195–202.

References to other published versions of this review

Becker 2008

Becker GE, McCormick FM, Renfrew MJ. Methods of milk expression for lactating women. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 4. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006170.pub2]

Becker 2011

Becker GE, Cooney F, Smith HA. Methods of milk expression for lactating women. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, Issue 12. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD006170.pub3]

* *Indicates the major publication for the study*

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Ahmed 2008

Methods	RCT with a convenience sample comparing 5 sessions of a breastfeeding educational programme for mothers of preterm infants verses routine care
Participants	Convenience sample of 60 mothers, who could read Arabic, to preterm (< 37 weeks' gestation) infants who were able and willing to breastfeed in Cairo, Egypt Mothers with medical problems or mothers of infants who had a serious illness that would affect breastfeeding were excluded from the study
Interventions	Educational intervention programme to improve mothers' knowledge of breastfeeding their preterm infants and to improve breastfeeding practices. Follow-up was for 3 months
Outcomes	Reported on when mothers started milk expression and their use of effective practices, which are included as an outcome measure of maternal satisfaction of achieving milk expression, and transfer to feeding at breast (breastfeeding on discharge)
Notes	There is no information available on funding for the study.

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information is given. Author has stated that a simple randomisation method was used
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information is given. Author has stated that a simple randomisation method was used
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	In correspondence with the author it is stated there were no incomplete data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Contamination could have occurred between the intervention and control groups, although the author states that this may only have happened with a small number of participants It is not clear from the published article if all intervention group received the 5 education sessions and not less or more sessions Selection bias appears to have occurred in

		assigning participants to the intervention and control groups, as the intervention group had twice as many multiparas (60%) compared to the control group (30%)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given. Given the nature of the intervention evaluated blinding of the mothers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given.

Auerbach 1990

Methods	RCT with cross-over took place at a range of 5 to 35 weeks' postnatal comparing 4 different regimens using an electric pump. Used a structured interview to obtain mother's views on which pumping method they preferred
Participants	26 breastfeeding mothers of healthy infants 5-35 weeks in age, already using a pump or planning to use a pump in the future. Data reported for 25 mothers. USA
Interventions	Compared 4 regimens: 5-minute sequential pumping (the breast pumped first assigned by random number table); 5-minute simultaneous pumping; unlimited time sequential pumping (first breast randomly assigned); or unlimited time simultaneous pumping. All mothers used the same type electric pump. Pumped at researcher's office, each regimen on a different day. No information on time between regimens other than that they were on different days
Outcomes	At each breast at each session: milk volume, time, milk fat concentration (creamatocrit) ; overall mother's views on pumping regimens
Notes	Insufficient data available in published article. Author contacted and provided some information; additional numerical data not available due to length of time since study. Pump and collection kits were provided by Medela, Inc

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Random number table.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Pumping sequences printed on cards, random number assigned a card to a mother
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Explanation given for any missing data.

Auerbach 1990 (*Continued*)

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	High risk	1 researcher designed and conducted the study and analysed the data

Bernabe-Garcia 2012

Methods	"randomised cross-over trial was conducted from November 2004 to June 2005" For each mother over a 4-day test period
Participants	"Inclusion criteria were as follows: 1) healthy breastfeeding women, 2) 18 years or older, 3) delivered a singleton preterm infant (gestational age at birth <37 weeks with attending physician's indication that the infant would be unable to breastfeed for at least 1 week due to critical illness), 4) more than14 days postpartum, 5) intention to continue breastfeeding, 6) using only hand expression to obtain their milk (as was the policy for hospitals affiliated with the IMSS at time of the study), and 7) willingness to be at the hospital for 4 consecutive days for 5 hour/day." A total of 116 preterm infants were admitted to the SCN during the 8-month study period. Of these candidates, 35 mothers (30%) were lactating during recruitment. Of those, 32 women agreed to participate. They were at 21.2 + 1.4 postpartum days and all were using hand expression of their milk prior to the study Mexico City.
Interventions	"Aim to compare four models of manual breast pumps (MBP) in regard to volume and nutritional composition of preterm milk, breast emptying, duration of expression, and negative pressure of the MBP, as well as maternal preference." Those mothers who agreed to participate were randomly assigned to 1 of 4 pump sequences, using Avent Isis and Medela Harmony (with squeeze handle mechanism), and Medela Little Heart/Caricia, and Evenflo - with cylinder-type mechanism "Each sterilized pump was tested for a 24-hour period that included a 5-hour period under hospital observation, conducting milk expression at 8:00 AM, 10:00 AM, and 12:00 noon. A MBP was then provided on loan to be used on the same day at home, where milk expression was conducted at least 3 additional times at 3-hour intervals to reach a minimum of 6 expressions per day, following the same procedures as used in the hospital. In order for each mother to use the four pumps, they participated for 4 consecutive days." At the end of the 4-day period, mothers were asked to complete a questionnaire to evaluate maternal MBP preference "to determine presence of hind milk…Electric pump (Lactina) was used after the first three expressions with each MBP per mother at the hospital setting."

Outcomes	"Milk volume was measured after both breasts were emptied with a MBP. Milk expression stopped when cessation of milk drops was reached. Extracted milk from right and left breasts was combined for total volume and labelled with date and hour at every expression…; home expressions were brought to the hospital the next morning. The sum of the milk volume expressed at the hospital and at home was considered as volume per 24 hours from each MBP." For each pump, "Nutritional composition was determined only in a sub-sample from mixed milk from both breasts collected at 12:00 noon by research personnel." Protein, lipids, and lactose, energy content "Breast emptying". "Duration of expression was determined as the pumping session measured in minutes, starting from the first drop of milk until cessation of milk drops from both breasts in the 3 pumping sessions at the hospital. The average from this was then considered as duration per mother per MBP." The data for this cross-over study were not available in paired format for inclusion in the analysis Maternal preference questionnaire (scale 1-7) (Fewtrell).
Notes	"Medela breast pumps were donated but without monetary donations and without establishing any compromise with the manufacturer. Evenflo and Isis breast pumps were purchased by a grant." "This investigation was supported by a financial grant from Fondo para el Fomento de la Investigación (FOFOI), IMSS, Mexico (No. IMSS-2004/006 to MBG)." "The authors declare that there is no contractual or commercial relationship with any manufacturers of the breast pumps studied." Published paper reported outcomes by group. Extensive additional data was provided by trialist on paired results for volume

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Not stated.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Assignment of the sequence was established prior to recruitment using sealed opaque envelopes consecutively numbered by one of the researchers who did not participate in the recruitment."
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	4 mothers did not complete the study protocol because their children were transferred to another hospital. 1 mother did not perform the evaluation with Harmony due to failure to arrive for the appointment on the third day. This was considered as missing data in the analyses

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	None apparent.
Other bias	High risk	Pumps tested as 3 & 4 showed higher milk yield than pumps used 1 & 2 - as more milk was removed more was produced, Too short a "wash-out" period to allow an effect to recede before the next pump was tested is possible
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Unfeasible due to nature of intervention.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Not stated.

Boo 2001

Methods	RCT comparing hand expression to use of a hand-held pump.
Participants	N = 28 participants. Control (hand expression) = 13, intervention (pump) = 15. Mothers of infants in NICU < 1501 g birthweight who were expressing at home or hospital and able to provide at least 2 milk samples of 5 mL. Mothers assigned to use breast pump group required to purchased their own hand-held pump that was capable of being disinfected with boiling water. Malaysia
Interventions	Control group taught hand-expression techniques. Intervention group taught techniques of using a hand-held pump (mother purchased hand-held pump of her choice). Written instruction provided in 3 languages and re-education provided as needed. Prior to each expression, hands were washed with soap and water and breasts with water and dried on a clean towel. Mothers who were at home stored their milk in home refrigerator and transported it to NICU in portable cooler within 24 hours of collection
Outcomes	Contamination of milk samples, infant illness (sepsis, NEC), infant death, breastfeeding on discharge
Notes	No loss of participants reported; however, 1 participant missing from the pump group in the table reporting comparison of mothers with at least 1 sample contaminated. Additional information provided by author that infants may not have received the milk that their mother expressed. Planned to recruit 42 mothers to each group in order to detect a 30% difference in rates of bacterial contamination, however, study stopped early due to high levels of contamination and infant illness. Project was funded by a grant from the Faculty of Medicine, Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**

Boo 2001 (*Continued*)

Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficent information in published article to make a judgement
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Consecutively numbered sealed envelopes. Participants randomised by the opening of a prepared envelope to 1 of 6 groups stratified for parity and gestational age
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Data missing from report.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Findings not reported in allocated groups, infant outcomes reported in relation to mother's method of expression though infants may not have received the milk
Other bias	High risk	Trial stopped early. More samples were included for mothers whose previous sample was contaminated. Reported analysis is by randomised groups for some items and by results of milk sampling for other items
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information on blinding of outcome assessors.

Boutte 1985

Methods	Randomised controlled cross-over trial comparing a large electric pump to a manual pump
Participants	9 breastfeeding mothers of healthy, middle class infants, mean age 3.2 months. Southwest USA
Interventions	Milk samples collected by large electric pump (Egnell) and by manual pump (Medela piston) used at home. During each 24-hour period, milk pumped from a single breast was weighed at each nursing by mother and breast to be pumped alternated at each nursing. Breastfeeding continued as normal. Pumps used approximately 1 week apart
Outcomes	Volume of milk mL/day, fat g/day, energy kcal/day, and asked mothers to rate the following: pump assembly, operation, dismantling, cleaning, physical discomfort, pain or anxiety during use and pump usage

Boutte 1985 (*Continued*)

Notes	Insufficient data available in published article. Not able to make contact with author. No funding source was declared. No loss of participants was reported

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"statistician prepared envelopes containing group assignment". Not able to make contact with author for further information
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Sequentially numbered envelopes.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No loss of participants reported. Not able to make contact with author for further information
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Not able to make contact with author for further information
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Outcome assessor reported as blinded.

Burton 2013

Methods	RCT comparing 2 different electric pumps.
Participants	71 mothers of preterm infants in neonatal unit. Pump A = 36, Pump S = 35. "Mothers were eligible if they delivered their infant(s) < 34 weeks' gestational age (including twin and singleton deliveries) and planned to express breast milk. Infant(s) were younger than 72 hours old at randomisation and were expected to stay in the NICU for at least 10 days; mothers who delivered at other hospitals but were transferred to a study unit were eligible if recruited by 72 hours postpartum." UK.
Interventions	Compare: "The Medela Symphony pump (pump S; Medela AG, Baar, Switzerland) has an initial "let-down" mode with rapid low suction (120/minute, vacuum -50 to -200 mmHg), followed by "expression mode" (45-78/minute, vacuum -50 to -250 mmHg) with slower rate and deeper suction. The duration of the letdown mode can be altered by the mother and the vacuum strength altered at any time. The Philips AVENT Twin

	electronic breast pump (pump A; Philips Consumer Lifestyle, Amsterdam, The Netherlands) incorporates a petal massage cushion in the breast shield, designed to massage the areola and surrounding breast during pumping, in an electronic pump that offers flexibility of rate and suction (vacuum range, 0 to -250 mmHg), with the rate/suction strength control button positioned on the breast shield to allow greater ease of control." "Following randomization, mothers were given verbal and written information (Appendix 1 and 2, available online) and help with expressing breast milk by the staff of the NICU or postnatal ward with additional help from the research nurses, who had specific experience in advising on breastfeeding in the NICU setting and who also provided specific instruction on the optimal use of the assigned breast pump. At 1 hospital, manual expression was used during the first 48 hours before introducing a breast pump, while at the other site, mothers started using a breast pump immediately after delivery. Pump S was the standard pump in both NICUs and was therefore used prior to study entry. Breast pumps were located in a designated room in the NICUs but pumps could also be used at the infant's bedside and were available for home use if a mother was discharged home. After the initial 10-day study period, mothers were encouraged to continue expressing milk using their allocated pump until their infant was discharged." Mothers recorded volume, time, etc, in a diary. On Day 10 mothers completed a maternal perception questionnaire using expanded Fewtrell scale to include "flexibility regarding the rate and amount of suction, location of control button, (and) speed of milk flow." "Between days 3 and 10 (ideally days 5-7) postpartum, each mother was asked to express milk for a single fixed 15-minute period using her assigned breast pump…. to determine the total weight of milk, the time to the first appearance of milk, and the time taken to produce specific milk weights."
Outcomes	"Primary outcome measures were total weight of milk expressed during the initial study period (to day 10); total weight of milk expressed in a single fixed 15-minute pumping session between 3 and 10 days (physiological test); and the time to first appearance of milk and time taken to express a fixed weight of milk (20 g, 40 g, 60 g) during this test Secondary outcome measures were total number of pumping sessions and total time spent expressing milk in the study period; mother's opinion of the assigned pump; total volume of maternal breast milk expressed and consumed by the infant while in the NICU; number of days taken for the infant to achieve full enteral feeds (150 mL/kg/day); and whether or not the mother was breastfeeding her infant(s) at discharge."
Notes	Flow chart of participants through the study in published paper Intended that 176 participants, however only reached 71 (36 + 35) "The authors disclosed receipt of the following financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: This study was supported by a grant from Philips AVENT (Philips Consumer Lifestyle, Amsterdam, The Netherlands), who also provided the breast pumps, and sponsored by the UCL Institute of Child Health. The funders and sponsors were not involved in conducting the study or analysing or interpreting the data." Contact was made with co-author Fewtrell and additional information provided. Previously reviewed as conference poster
Risk of bias	

Burton 2013 (*Continued*)

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	" mothers were randomized to use 1 of the study pumps for a 10-day study period; randomization was stratified by the infant's gestation (≤ 28 weeks, and 29-33 weeks) and by parity."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Randomization schedules (permuted blocks of randomized length) were prepared by a member of the study team who was not involved in practical aspects of the study, and assignments were held in sealed opaque envelopes."
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	"The number of subjects with complete 10-day milk diary data was 33 (92%) versus 29 (83%) for pump A and pump S, respectively, with discharge data available for 30 (83%) versus 25 (74%) subjects."
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting. All outcomes in trial registration are reported in published paper
Other bias	Unclear risk	"The authors declared the following potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article: The study was funded by Philips AVENT. Dr Burton, Dr Fewtrell, and Professor Lucas have also received an unrestricted research grant from Philips AVENT."
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information.

Costa 1989

Methods	Quasi-randomised trial using infant ID number.
Participants	65 mothers of preterm infants in neonatal unit who intended to provide breast milk for tube feeding, able to read and write English. C = 34, I = 31. Mid-USA
Interventions	Control group were instructed verbally and in writing to shower daily using mild soap, to wash their hands with Phisoderm soap (provided) immediately before pumping intervention, and not to use special preparations on their breasts. Intervention group had the same instructions plus to clean their breasts from the nipple outwards in a circular pattern with a cloth dampened with water and Phisoderm soap, then to rinse with a clean cloth. Both groups were given sterile milk collection equipment and had pump use demonstrated
Outcomes	Bacterial colony counts in a 1-time 15 cc sample of milk. Excessive colony counts were reported as containing > 50,000 CFU/mL
Notes	Insufficient data were available in the published article. Not able to make contact with author. No loss of participants reported. Incomplete data reported for 1 participant. Support was provided by grants from the American Nurses Foundation and Wintrop-Breon Laboratories makers of the anti-bacterial soap

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	Assigned by odd or even infant ID number.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	High risk	Assigned by odd or even infant ID number.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	No loss of participants reported. Incomplete data reported for 1 participant
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.

De Carvalho 1985

Methods	Cross-over trial in first 28 days after birth to examine relationship of milk production to frequency of milk expression. Study started postnatal day 5. Both arms lasted 1 week, each consecutively. There was no follow-up
Participants	25 healthy mothers of premature non-nursing infants in the NICU
Interventions	Different frequencies of breast-milk expression with an electric breast pump (Egnell) Arm 1: Express milk $\geq$ 4 times a day. Arm 2: Express milk $\leq$ 3 times a day.
Outcomes	Total milk production over 24 hours.
Notes	Unable to contact study author to answer any queries on study design or methods. Unable to obtain any useable data. Of the 25 women, 9 changed frequency after the first week and 9 stayed at the same frequency. It is unclear from the published report if this was part of the study design or if some participants refused to change frequency in the second week

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Paper just stated 'card selection process', no other information provided
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Do not know how many mothers were assigned to the different arms in the study, how many completed the study or if there are any incomplete outcome data 1 mother used manual expression on the Sabbath (no information on how the quantity of milk expressed differed on the Sabbath compared to the assigned study methods or if the quantity if milk expressed by hand was included in the analysis)
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes reported in the study design are reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	Limited information given on study design and methods. No information if there was a 'washout period' between pumps tested
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided but due to study design this would not have been possible

De Carvalho 1985 (*Continued*)

Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided.

Feher 1989

Methods	RCT assessing the effect of a relaxation intervention during milk pumping
Participants	Mothers of preterm infants expected to be in NICU for at least 10 days in 2 sites were approached 3-5 days postpartum. 71 participants randomised and 55 completed the study (77.5%). Control group = 33 randomised and 25 (76%) completed the study. Intervention group = 38 randomised and 30 (79%) completed the study. Reasons for failure to complete the study are described. South-west USA
Interventions	Intervention group given 20-minute audio cassette tape of progressive relaxation exercises and guided imagery to listen to daily, especially before pumping milk, with tape player loaned if needed. Both groups received information on use of "the electric pump" (type not stated) and routine care. Unclear if milk sample was from a time-restricted expression
Outcomes	A single expression of breast milk obtained at the hospital during the second week of life. Measured for volume of milk and fat content/creamatocrit %. Mothers were asked about their use of the relaxation tape, and mothers' view of using the tape
Notes	Unsuccessful in attempt to contact authors. Authors carried out subgroup analysis of ventilated babies and of low income primiparous woman. These subgroups were not used in the review as the published data were insufficient. Partial funding was provided by the University of New Mexico School of Medicine through a National Institutes of Health grant

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method of randomisation not described.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Unclear. Unsuccessful in attempt to contact authors.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Reasons for withdrawal described.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.

Feher 1989 (*Continued*)

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.

Fewtrell 2001a

Methods	RCT with cross-over to compare a manual and an electric pump among mothers of term infants commencing at approximately 6 weeks of age
Participants	Mothers of infants over 37 weeks' gestation were approached on the postnatal ward to participate. If they agreed, they were contacted at home when their infant was about 6 weeks old. 60 participants recruited and 58 completed both arms of the cross-over (96.6%). UK
Interventions	Avent ISIS (manual) and Medela mini-electric breast pumps were each tested on 1 occasion by breastfeeding mothers when infant was approximately 8 weeks old. Each pump was given 48 hours before the test to allow familiarisation. Second pump was tested 2-3 days after the first pump. Pump was used for 10 minutes on each breast in the presence of 2 researcher staff and milk collected. Each mother completed a questionnaire of their opinion for each pump
Outcomes	Volume (weight) of milk from each breast in the set time period, weight of milk produced minute by minute to examine milk flow pattern, creamatocrit at 1-minute intervals, and mother's opinion on pumps
Notes	Mothers could choose a pump to keep. Additional data requested from author. Insufficient data were available to include in analysis; the average of each woman's difference in outcomes between the 2 treatments and its confidence interval was not reported, only reported the average result for each treatment over all women. "This study was supported by a grant from Canon Avent who also provided the breast pumps."

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation was in permuted blocks of randomised length.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Sealed opaque envelopes.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Participants missing and not mentioned.

Fewtrell 2001a (*Continued*)

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	The average of each woman's difference in outcomes between the 2 treatments and its confidence interval was not reported, only reported the average result for each treatment over all women
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.

Fewtrell 2001b

Methods	RCT comparing a manual pump (Avent Isis) and an electric pump (Egnell/Ameda) among mothers of preterm infants
Participants	145 mothers who delivered a preterm infant < 35 weeks' gestation were recruited within 3 days of birth. If necessary mothers started pumping using a standard pump on their unit before entry into trial. manual pump (MP) group = 74, data reported on 60 (81%) ; electric pump (EP) group = 71 data reported on 58 (81.7%) for milk expression frequency, time and volume data, however, maternal satisfaction data were reported for only 78.4% in the MP group and 69% in the EP group. UK
Interventions	Both groups received standard information from the midwifery/nursing staff of the unit which recommended pumping at least 6 times a day, starting with 5 minutes each breast and increasing as tolerated. Mothers using the EP were encouraged to simultaneously pump but it was up to the mother to chose to do this or not and could vary method at different times. Mothers completed a form each time they pumped or attempted breastfeeding. At 7-10 days postpartum mothers completed a questionnaire on their views of their assigned pump (ease of use, comfort, pleasant to use, overall opinion and amount of suction). Mothers left the study at first of the end points reached: stopped using assigned pump, stopped completing forms, infant no longer in the unit, infant fully breastfeeding. Median (25th, 75th centile) length of stay was 14 (7, 25) days in the EP group and 16 (9, 30) days in the MP group
Outcomes	Mother's opinion of pump used (questionnaire), volume of milk over the trial period and at a set time, time spent pumping, and proportions of women that developed sore nipples, engorgement or mastitis in each group
Notes	A sub-sample of mothers volunteered to provide a milk sample at 1 20-minute session during 2nd week postpartum for a creamatocrit and for the volume of milk expressed in the set time. These mothers also were studied for the time taken to express a set amount

Fewtrell 2001b (*Continued*)

	of milk. Additional information provided by author. "This study was supported by a grant from Canon Avent who also provided the Isis manual pumps."

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomised using permuted blocks of randomised length stratified by infant's sex and gestation (< 30 weeks and 31-34 weeks)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Assignments were in sealed opaque envelopes prepared by a research team member not involved in practical aspects of the study
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Additional details provided by author.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given. Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.

Flaherman 2012

Methods	RCT comparing hand expression with use of an electric pump.
Participants	68 mothers of healthy newborns 12-36 hours old who were latching or sucking poorly during birth hospitalisation with Level I care only 35 allocated to hand expression, 33 allocated to pump. Sample drawn in 2007-2009 from 3 postpartum units in California Exclusion: mothers less than 18 years old, non English speaking, history of low milk supply or breast surgery other than cyst removal, infants less than 37 weeks' gestation, less than 2000g birthweight, or needing level II or III care
Interventions	Electric pump (Ameda Elite hospital Grade and Medela Lactina, with mothers instructed to double pump) vs hand expression (taught)

	"Single intervention 15 minute session of pumping or hand expression under supervision of study staff." Milk volume measured. Baby weighed before and after feeding on the same scale. Follow-up survey questions at 1 week, 1 month, and 2 months assessed breastfeeding, milk expression and formula use
Outcomes	Breast pain on scale 1-10 (Holdcroft scale) (only in published conference abstract, not in full published paper), expressed milk volume (in 1 expression), breastfeeding self-efficacy (modified Dennis scale), breastfeeding prevalence at 1 week, 1 month & 2-month, newly developed breast milk experience measure (BMEE) that "included questions about social support for milk expression and personal and learning experience of milk expression" and reports some aspects in table form and some aspects descriptively across three published papers
Notes	Included in the 2011 version of this review as a conference poster. Breast pain and volume used as reported in the conference proceedings only, as data in published paper were not in a format suitable for analysis This project was supported by grant number KL2 RR024130 from the National Center for Research Resources and grants number 5 K12 HD052 and 1K23HD059818-01A1 from the National Institute of Children Health and Human Development

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	"Stratified randomization, with randomly permuted blocks of 2 and 4. Stratified by site and delivery method."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"The allocation sequence for randomisation was generated by an independent biostatistician; assignments were placed into sealed opaque envelopes by an independent administrative assistant. Immediately following enrolment, the study investigator opened sequential envelopes in the presence of a second clinician and revealed the randomisation arm."
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Additional details provided by trialist. "68 mothers participated in the one session intervention. Final outcome assessment at 2 months for 48 mothers (70.6%): 9 Hand Expression, 11 pump group (p = 0.49). Difficulty finding the mothers the main reason for missing outcome data."

Flaherman 2012 (*Continued*)

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Description of BMEE and outcomes measured differs between published papers. Items mentioned in the initial poster were checked with published paper and companion paper on BMEE scale examined. The BMEE scale was under development as a companion study to this RCT. It then had 16 items. The items subsequently dropped from the scale included the items reported on in this paper (scale reduced to 11 items) Trialist's reply was " Pain scale results were dropped due to space at one point" and that the reported "11 items are the final scale"
Other bias	Unclear risk	None of the hand expression group mothers were using hand expression at 2 months; were using a pump (if any milk expression)
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Unfeasible.

Francis 2008

Methods	RCT comparing 3 different electric pumps.
Participants	60 term breastfeeding women approached at day 3 postpartum and completed the study. USA
Interventions	"Assigned one of three single electric pumps: Avent Isis IQ Uno (AIU); the Medela Swing (MSW); and the Whittlestone single electric (WSE). Instructed as per manufacturer's instructions. For 60 days, each participant completely expressed one breast on one occasion each morning alternating breasts daily, recorded pumping time in minutes, and volume in mL. For the first 7 days of the study, the participants were observed pumping in their home by an IBCLC and time to milk ejection was observed and recorded."
Outcomes	Time to milk ejection during the first week postpartum, mean time to empty one breast, milk volume pumped, time to express milk, milk flow rate, and infant growth tracked over the 60 days of pump use
Notes	Study was presented as a conference poster presented in 2008. This review was unsuccessful in obtaining suitable data for inclusion in the 2011 publication. Lead study author J Francis provided unpublished data for this (2014) review

Francis 2008 (*Continued*)

Risk of bias		
Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Group assignment using a random number generator.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	The authors state they only used complete data (60 mothers), 24 mothers dropped out. No information is given if or how the incomplete data affected the results of the study. Each arm of the study had 20mothers with complete data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Initial study outcomes (as per email communication Feb 2007) mentioned lipid analysis and vitamin content that are not mentioned in this conference poster abstract or unpublished paper
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is provided but due to study design this would not have been possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided.

Garza 1982

Methods	Cross-over study, in the fourth week of lactation, with mothers 'randomly' assigned to compare the effect of method and storage of expressed breast milk on nutritional composition of breast milk. 3 experiments examined method of expression (experiment 1) and storage of expressed breast milk (experiment 2 and 3). Experiment 1 was applicable to this review, the remaining experiments were excluded as they were not relevant to this review
Participants	At time of study: non-smoking mothers, in good health, aged 20-35 years, who were exclusive breastfeeding their first or second child (also in good health). 18 mothers were recruited
Interventions	Experiment 1: hand expression compared to large electric pump (Egnell)

Garza 1982 (*Continued*)

Outcomes	Experiment 1: nutrient quantity (fat and total nitrogen) and quantity of milk expressed. Complete data only available for total nitrogen
Notes	Unable to contact study author to clarify any questions concerning study design, methods or results

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information available.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information available.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes reported in the study design are presented in the results
Other bias	Unclear risk	Limited information presented in the paper on study design, methods and results
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given but due to study design this would not have been possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.

Groh-Wargo 1995

Methods	RCT comparing simultaneous and sequential pumping with an electric pump in mothers of infants in a NICU
Participants	32 mothers of infants < 1500 g at birth, who were providing breast milk and willing to keep a log of milk production and to submit it weekly for 6 weeks or until infant was nursing freely, were included in the analyses. 16 were allocated to sequential pumping group and 16 were allocated to simultaneous pumping group. 4 weeks minimum participation time was required for inclusion. Infants < 7 days old at entering study. Level III NICU. Mid-west USA
Interventions	Simultaneous group used double pumping kit provided and instructed to pump for total of 20 minutes every 3 hours except at night, with a minimum of 4 times in 24 hours. Amended to mothers pumping for as long as milk was flowing without time limits. Sequential group pumped initially 10 minutes per breast and amended to no restriction

Groh-Wargo 1995 (*Continued*)

	on time. Minimum pumping was for 4 weeks, maximum for 6 weeks or until the baby able to nurse freely. Both groups were provided with a Medela electric pump
Outcomes	Quantity of milk expressed (mL/week), time taken to express milk (hours/week), change in serum prolactin
Notes	No loss of participants reported. Both research groups received more support and encouragement (from research nurse) than did mothers not in the research groups. Also assessed State-Trait Anxiety (not an outcome in this review). Additional information provided by author. Supported by a grant from Medela, Inc, and by National Institutes of Health

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Author reply: "statistician prepared envelopes containing group assignment"
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Envelopes pulled in sequence as participants recruited by the researcher
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	No loss of participants reported.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	High risk	Both research groups received more support and encouragement (from research nurse) than did mothers not in the research groups
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Outcome assessor reported as blinded.

Hayes 2008

Methods	RCT to determine whether an electric breast pump vs a manual pump would increase breastfeeding duration

Participants	280 healthy women (and healthy babies) using state support services for low-income families (WIC) and planning to return to work or education were enrolled during last prenatal or first postnatal visit. Data on duration analysed for 229. 17 excluded for incomplete or other data collection difficulties. USA
Interventions	Loan of electric pump or manual pump and instructions on their use
Outcomes	Breastfeeding for at least 6 months.
Notes	No response from authors. Not an outcome specified in the protocol. Power calculation reported and authors state study may be underpowered The electric breast pump loan evaluation project was made possible by a cooperative agreement (TS-0619-17/17) from the Association of Teachers of Preventive Medicine and the Division of the Nutrition and Physical Activity, National Center for Chronic Disease and Health Promotion, at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information in published article. No reply from authors.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information in published article. No reply from authors.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Described.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	High risk	Authors note there may have been some violations of protocol with mothers using pumps other than that assigned to them
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information in published article. No reply from authors.

Hill 1999

Methods	RCT comparing sequential and simultaneous pumping with an electric pump
Participants	49 mothers in 2 tertiary care centres over a 24-month period who were planning to exclusively pump their milk for the first 6 weeks for their preterm (< 32 weeks) and low birthweight (<= 1500 g) infant(s), who spoke English or Spanish, had a telephone, were non-smokers and had no history of thyroid or other endocrine disorders. Phone questionnaire was used three weeks after the study period. Data were reported on 39 mothers (20.4% loss) SEQ = 20/26 (83.3%), SIM = 19/23 (82.6%). Mothers were paid $150 and allowed to continue using the electric pump for 6 weeks after end of trial. USA
Interventions	Mothers instructed on the use of the assigned pumping system by the research staff. Protocol consisted of pumping 8 times per day. SEQ group was to pump for a minimum of 5 minutes, then switch to the other side and repeat this twice for a minimum of 10 minutes for each breast. SIM group was instructed to pump for 10 minutes or until 1 breast was no longer dripping. Mothers kept a log for 6 weeks after delivery recording day and time of each pumping
Outcomes	Mean weekly weight of milk pumped, pumping frequency (only descriptive data provided), relationship of selected variables to adequate (>= 3500 g/week) milk supply (only descriptive data provided), mothers' views of pump at 9 weeks (only descriptive data provided)
Notes	Author provided additional data. The research was supported by the University of Illinois at Chicago, College of Nursing; National Institutes of Health; National Institute of Nursing Research, and Medela, Inc

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants randomly assigned to either SEQ or SIM pumping system by means of blocks of 6 to balance the pumping regimen after each 6 participants were enrolled. Information on allocation concealment not provided
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Author provided further information.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"data analyst was not part of data collection".

Hopkinson 2009

Methods	RCT with cross-over at 5 weeks postpartum comparing a standard electric pump to a novel electric pump commencing at 3 weeks postpartum among mothers of term infants, with cross-over after 2 weeks of pump use
Participants	Inclusion criteria: healthy mother and infant, term birth (> 37 weeks' gestation) intention to breast feed exclusively for at least 4 months and no or minimal experience using an electric breast pump. Recruited before or within 2 weeks of delivery. 69 women enrolled; 34 for the full protocol (with blood samples for hormonal analysis) and 35 for a truncated protocol (no blood sampling). USA
Interventions	All mothers were randomised to 1 of 2 electric pumps for use over a 2-week period once in the morning and once later in the day. The standard pump, Pump in Style®, Medela was compared to a novel pump, Embrace®, Playtex. After the initial 2-week period of use, there was one 10-minute controlled laboratory test session, followed by (at 5 weeks postpartum) the cross-over with assignment to the other pump for a period of several days and the other test session. Following this, mothers were invited to select 1 of the pumps to keep
Outcomes	Indicators of maternal satisfaction with maternal ranking of pump performance using an adapted scale graded on a Likert scale of 1-7 on 10 aspects (ease of use, strength of suction, feeling of suction, sound, comfort, assembly, overall opinion, plus three aspects of maternal expectation based on continued use of a pump on effect on milk supply, effect on nipples and effect on frequency of use of pump and pump preference. Indications of adverse effects: breast or nipple pain. Quantity of milk was assessed in 2 ways: stimulation of milk volume and milk extraction test (cross-over design). Nutrient quality by milk fat on creamatocrit of milk expressed at the beginning and end of the 10-minute period and reported as in g/L at baseline, at the end of the 10-minute test and as the change (0 to10 minutes) in a cross-over design; as the data were not available in a paired data format, it was not suitable for inclusion in the analysis. Maternal physiological effects: prolactin and oxytocin response to pumping at 5 weeks postpartum at pre and up to 40 minute post initiation of 10-minute pumping
Notes	Further information was provided by the author. Regarding intervention integrity, among the full protocol group, 34 were assigned, 3 dropped out before received pump (2 standard, 1 novel). Of the 31 remaining, blood sampling carried out on 30 and of these paired oxytocin samples were available on 24 women. In the truncated protocol, 35 assigned, 3 dropped out before providing data (2 standard and 1 novel), leaving 32 participants.

Hopkinson 2009 (*Continued*)

	Overall, of the 62 participants referred to by the trialists, 59 were available for the volume tests, 58 for the fat content and up to 58 reported on maternal satisfaction Use of a special elastic bra: from email from author on 7/1/11 "The first 11 mothers in the study were given the hands free pumping bra by the nursing staff at the beginning of the study to facilitate pumping....[It] apparently did bias the results because it was much easier to insert the standard pump flange into the bra and more difficult to insert the novel flange." Other outcomes described included: time to express; maternal compliance with recommended frequency of use in the home setting; duration of breastfeeding following return to the workforce at 6/12 postpartum and milk extraction efficiency/degree of breast emptying Support was provided through a grant from Playtex Products, Inc, manufacturers of 1 of the pumps being tested

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Random number table.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Assignments were conveyed to study assistants by phone from a central co-ordinating office
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All loss of participants or samples described. Incomplete outcome data were adequately addressed
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	High risk	Use of a commercially available special elastic bra for hands-free pumping by 11 mothers
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided. Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Data entry was conducted by personnel blinded to group assignment as were laboratory tests of prolactin and oxytocin

Jones 2001

Methods	RCT comparing sequential and simultaneous pumping with an electric pump Cross-over design was used to examine effect on expressed milk volume from breast massage with each mother acting as her own control
Participants	UK Neonatal unit. Mothers wishing to pump their milk for their own preterm infant, approached 24 hours after birth. Mothers excluded if they were unable to pump a minimum of 5 times a day or had retained products of conception. 52 participants randomised and 36 completed the study (69%). Sequential group = 27 randomised and 19 (70%) completed the study. Simultaneous group = 25 randomised and 17 (68%) completed the study. Study period started day 4-7 postpartum and lasted 4 days
Interventions	Large electric breast pump (Egnell Ameda Elite) was loaned to all mothers for the duration of the trial. 1 group pumped breasts sequentially and 1 group pumped breasts simultaneously. Both groups encouraged to pump 8 times a day, until milk no longer entered the collection set. A variety of pump flange sizes were provided On 2 of the days pumping was preceded by breast massage, with the first day for familiarisation and data only collected on the second day Log book was used to record date, time and duration of pumping. Researchers calculated milk volume and fat content Women completed 2 questionnaires using an analogue scale for their opinion of pump comfort and performance, and perception of the effect of breast massage
Outcomes	Volume of milk in a single expression, fat content of expressed milk in a single expression, mother's opinion on pump comfort and effectiveness, feeding method at 37 weeks' gestation (reported descriptively). The data were not available in a format that could be included in RevMan analysis
Notes	Calculated sample size was 39 participants in each arm of the study. Recruitment ceased after data analysed on 36 women were found to be significant. Insufficient data were provided in the published article and author was unable to provide additional data when contacted Project funded by Baby Lifeline. Ameda Egnell donated collection sets

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Insufficient data were provided in the published article and author was unable to provide additional data when contacted
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants randomised by the opening of a prepared envelope to 1 of 6 groups stratified for parity and gestational age. "Randomisation for massage on either days 1,2 or days 3,4 using sets of sealed envelopes."

Jones 2001 (*Continued*)

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	Trial stopped early as "interim analysis .. . showed highly significant results". 31% without complete data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Descriptive reporting made it difficult to judge.
Other bias	High risk	Author did not appear to have access to the data to respond to queries
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available.

Keith 2012

Methods	RCT, parallel. Data collected for 14 days with each participant
Participants	Mothers (mixed parity) of infants in NICU born before 38 weeks or critically ill and providing breast milk. 162 completed the study. No withdrawals. Mean age of infant at enrolment was 1.4 to 2.1 days across groups. Mean gestation: 31.3 to 32.5 across groups. No infants over 38 weeks' gestation. Exclusion criteria included mothers receiving medications known to alter breast milk production, mothers experiencing mastitis, mothers with prior breast surgery, and mothers who smoke. Georgia, USA
Interventions	Control plus 3 intervention groups. A = control, no recordings, B = verbal guided imagery + music guitar lullabies ("second experimental group"), C = verbal + music + images of own infant ("third experimental group"), D = verbal only ("first experimental group") "Each group received standard medical, nursing, lactation education, and support in initiating and maintaining breast milk production. Generally, mothers were encouraged to pump 8 times daily for about 10 minutes." Double pump provided for use at home. 3 experimental groups received mp3 players with a recording of approximately 12 minutes in duration. Instructed to listen to tape "as often as possible" while double pumping
Outcomes	The following research questions guided this study: A. Are music-listening interventions efficacious in increasing the amount of milk produced by preterm mothers? There were 3 experimental treatments and 14 days, with 42 comparisons made to assess efficacy and reported mean milk obtained (mL/day) by group B. Are music-listening interventions efficacious in improving the quality of breast milk as measured by fat content or caloric content? 1mL fat sample collected by mother daily near to noon and presented as mean percentage fat content/day by group No other outcomes reported. Published paper displayed results in figure and tables and

	further data was provided by researchers. Four days (Day 1, 5, 10 and 14) were selected for entry into analysis with any of the interventions versus no intervention
Notes	Supported in part by the MedCen Foundation, Macon GA, grant 23750(10/1/08-9/30/09)

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	"Simple randomization was based on a randomized permutation as obtained from SAS Proc Plan."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"No adverse events, 100% compliance once treatment assigned to patient; no withdrawals during study."
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	None apparent.
Other bias	Low risk	None apparent.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, listening to a recording or not, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Data collectors performing the Creamatocrit measurement were blinded to group membership of the participants."

Meier 2008

Methods	Randomised controlled multi-site trial comparing 2 electric pumps as well as suction patterns in 2 protocols Protocol I examining single-and multi-phase patterns in the SBP on 6 occasions, after which mothers selected 1 of the 3 suction patterns to use during the rest of their baby's stay in the neonatal unit Protocol II examined 1 of 2 suction patterns for 7 days.
Participants	Protocol 1: 35 English or Spainsh speaking mothers of infants who weighed < 1250 g and/or were born ≤ 32 weeks' gestation who were pumping and had achieved a daily milk output of at least 350 mL/day. Protocol I was undertaken in 1 tertiary care hospital in the USA Protocol 2:65 English or Spainsh speaking mothers of infants who weighed < 1250 g and/or were born ≤ 32 weeks' gestation who were pumping and had achieved a daily

	milk output of at least 350 mL/day. Protocol II was undertaken at 3 tertiary care hospitals in the USA
Interventions	Protocol 1: women were randomised to single-and multi-phase patterns in the Symphony breast pump (SBP) on 6 occasions Protocol 2: women were randomised to 1 of 2 suction patterns of the Symphony breast pump (SBP) for all pumping for 7 days
Outcomes	Protocol 1: time to milk ejection, total pumping time, milk output at 5-minute intervals, total milk output, maternal perceptions questionnaires using a 5-point Likert scale. Scores were reported by categories: efficiency and effectiveness measured by maternal ratings of the quickness of flow, rhythm of suction pattern, milk removal; comfort measured by natural feel of suction and overall comfort; convenience measured by rating ease of use and timesaving, and not a format that could be included in the analysis Protocol 2: mean total daily milk output; post-pumping creamatocrit values; and maternal perception of the efficiency, efficacy, comfort and convenience of the suction pattern. Reported by randomised group the mean percentage post-pumping creamatocrit values measured on hind-milk samples obtained at the completion of pumping for approximately half of their sample. The reported data are divided into left and right breast and not in a format that could be included in the analysis so we report it descriptively
Notes	Meier 2008 had 2 protocols in this cross-over trial, and they were treated as separate studies. The data provided in the published paper were not suitable for inclusion in the analysis and we were unsuccessful in attempts to contact first or second authors

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given just that 35 women completed the study
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Protocol I states that mothers were blinded but no information is given for personnel, it is for this reason that the risk of bias is marked as unclear. In protocol II the paper reports that both researchers and mothers were blinded

Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given.

Meier 2012

Methods	RCT to compare the effectiveness,efficiency, comfort and convenience of breast pump suction patterns (BPSP)
Participants	128 breast-pump dependent mothers with infants (born $\leq$ 34 weeks' gestation) admitted to a level 3 NICU and anticipate to remain in NICU for $\geq$ 15 days
Interventions	Standard vs experimental BPSP for initiation and maintenance of lactation: Arm 1: experimental initiation BPSP vs experimental maintenance BPSP Arm 2: experimental initiation BPSP vs standard maintenance BPSP Arm 3: standard initiation BPSP vs standard maintenance BPSP
Outcomes	Milk output in 15 minutes of pumping though did not report the total volume over the session, and maternal perceptions of effectiveness, efficiency, comfort and convenience similar to Meier 2008
Notes	No arm examined standard initiation BPSP vs experimental maintenance BPSP. Unable to contact study author to obtain useable data

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomised block design.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	All BPSPs were embedded in identical appearing cards that were coded only by number and inserted into the breast pump
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Only included data from mothers with at least 9 days of consecutive data collection but study duration was 14 days
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	All outcomes listed in the design of the study are presented, however study duration was 14 days and it is not stated why only data from mothers with 9 days of data are included for analysis
Other bias	Low risk	None apparent.

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Mothers were blinded but no information is provided about blinding of personnel
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given.

Mersmann 1994

Methods	RCT 3 treatment cross-over design, assignment to 1 of 6 treatment sequences. Data collected for 14 days with each participant
Participants	26 mothers asked, 21 agree to participate, 2 did not meet criteria and 1 did not complete the study due to illness of the investigator = 18 mothers of 21 non-nursing hospitalised preterm infants completed the study Exclusions: non-English speaking, expressing milk for less than 2 weeks, mothers with medical conditions, mothers who had previously received TT New York, USA.
Interventions	Each participant acted as their own control receiving Therapeutic Touch (TT), Mimic Therapeutic Touch (MTT), and No Treatment (NT) administered by nurses trained in either TT or MTT, with investigator outside the room Minimum of 24 hours between treatments scheduled on 3 of 5 consecutive days. Interval since last expression and time of day was kept constant for each mother Mothers maintained their usual milk pumping routine (Egnell lact-e electric pump - single); diary documented routine Mothers instructed to pump until they were "finished". "After expressing the first breast, 1-2 mL of the hind milk was expressed into a separate container for fat measurement immediately after each expression Mother completed a VAS on her perception of infant's health status before each session (mother's stress) "Therapeutic Touch is the knowledgeable and purposive patterning of the human-environmental energy field process in which the [practitioner] assumes a meditative form of awareness and without physical contact uses her hands as a focus for the patterning." In MTT the purposive patterning by the (nurse) is done while focusing on repetitive hand movements and distraction
Outcomes	Mothers' comments on treatments (descriptive). Did leaking occur during treatment (dichotomous). Quantity of expressed milk (continuous). Length of time of milk pumping (continuous). Fat content - 3 creamatocrits (percentage fat) on hind milk sample (1-2 mL) (continuous) Reported by group with no participant specific/paired data available for inclusion in the analysis
Notes	Reported by group, no participant-specific/paired data available for inclusion in RevMan No funding source listed. Full thesis was used as no publications could be found. Unable

Mersmann 1994 (*Continued*)

	to make contact

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Random numbers table to assign treatment sequence.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	1 participant did not complete the study due to illness of the investigator and data not collected. The participant's data were not included
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	This thesis provides a high level of detail and no indication of selective reporting
Other bias	Low risk	Detailed description of training of treatment nurses in TT, MTT and NT and measures to avoid bias in this thesis
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants received each treatment and were not told which treatments they were receiving Personnel were aware which treatment they were providing.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information.

Parker 2012

Methods	Randomised control pilot trial comparing the effects of timing of initiation of pumping following delivery. Reported at days 1-7, 21 and 42
Participants	Mothers of VLBW in tertiary care neonatal unit. Mean infant birthweight was 9994.2 g, mean gestation age 27.4 weeks. Participants: 10 in each of 2 groups reported "A convenience sample of 20 pregnant women carrying a singleton fetus with an estimated gestational age <32 weeks and an estimated fetal weight of <1500 g were recruited for this feasibility study from a labor and delivery unit associated with a level III tertiary neonatal intensive care unit. Exclusion criteria consisted of (1) younger than 18 years, (2) no intention to breastfeed, (3) non-English speaking, (4) presence of major fetal anomalies, (5) illicit maternal drug use, (6) history of breast reduction or augmentation, (7) positive HIV status or (8) the fetus not expected to live over 2 weeks following delivery." 32 mothers consented during pregnancy, 10 were excluded as infant did not meet the

	inclusion criteria after birth. Researcher did not get to randomise within 1 hour for 2 consented and eligible mothers. 1 pregnant woman approached declined to participate
Interventions	Group I began using electric pump within 1 hour following delivery, and Group II between 1-6 hours. Mothers pumped in neonatal unit or at home "Simultaneous expression Symphony pump (Medela), instructed to pump simultaneously for 15 minutes at least 8 times a day, though if the mother choose, to pump 10 minutes on each side sequentially. If milk was still flowing, instructed to continue for 2 min after flow of milk ceased." Given written and verbal instructions "Mothers in both groups were instructed to record in a daily log book the date, time and duration of each pumping session, type of pump used and whether they received lactation consultation. Frequency, timing and length of Kangaroo care were also recorded. If the infant breastfed during the 24-h milk volume measurement session, intake was measured by test weighing prior to and following breastfeeding."
Outcomes	Mean milk volumes days 1 to 7, day 21 and day 42 by weighing each container of expressed milk brought in by the mother and summing together and timing of LGS2 (lactogenesis stage II) by mother's report of sudden breast fullness
Notes	Trialist provided responses by email for 2011 review (conference poster) though did not respond to queries following publication of full paper more recently

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	"Sequentially numbered, identical, opaque sealed envelopes, each containing a 2-inch by 2-inch paper designating Group I or Group II."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"Assignment were made upon delivery. Envelopes were opened sequentially after writing the subject's tracking information on the envelope."
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	20 mothers commenced (10 early + 10 late initiation). At 3 weeks, data reported for 8 early + 7 late initiation. At 6 weeks, data reported for 6 early + 4 late initiation. No information available regarding the other participants, if they ceased pumping because infant was feeding effectively at the breast, ceased using mother's milk, or were lost to contact
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	None apparent.

Parker 2012 (*Continued*)

Other bias	Unclear risk	None apparent.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given.

Paul 1996

Methods	Cross-over RCT comparing hand expression and manual pump (Medela) expression. Study done in 2 phases Phase 1: 22 women expressed on postnatal days 4&5. Phase 2: 14 women, separate to phase 1, expressed on postnatal days 4&5 and postnatal 8&9
Participants	Mothers of neonates in the neonatal unit (mean gestation age 34 weeks) who were unable to suck at the breast and their mothers wished to breastfeed. Mothers were 'well enough' to visit the feeding room and already expressing prior to the start of the study
Interventions	Arm 1: M-P-M-P-M-P sequence of expression. Arm 2: P-M-P-M-P-M sequence of expression. Express 3 times a day for a fixed 15 minutes at 10am, 12pm and 2pm. (Total of 6 expressions in phase 1 and 42 in phase 2). Alternate method each expression (no 'washout period)
Outcomes	Maternal preference of the method (dichotomous data included) Quantity of milk during a 15-minute session is presented by session and method overall and no between subject data is provided to include in the analysis
Notes	Author did not respond to queries on study methods (i.e. intervention integrity) and only mention of the study being a RCT is that the mothers 'In a randomised fashion' were assigned to their group. Phase 2 appears that it was not included in the original study design but was added following completion of phase 1 No information was available to clarify if these 3 test times were the only times milk volume was measured or if mothers only expressed three times in total over 24 hours for their infants who were not nursing at the breast Study formed part of an ICMR Study on nutrition of low birthweight neonates

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"In a randomised fashion, a subgroup of 11 subjects used the manual (M) method at the initial expression, while the other 11

Paul 1996 (*Continued*)

		subjects started with the pump (P) expression."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information given.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcomes reported in study design are reported in the results section
Other bias	Unclear risk	Author did not respond to queries on study methods (i.e. intervention integrity). Potential for the use of 1 method to extract more milk at 1 session thus increasing the amount of milk produced for the next session as there was no "washout period" between methods
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given but due to study design this would not have been possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given.

Pessoto 2010

Methods	RCT comparing hand expression, manual pump and electric pump among mothers of preterm infants
Participants	45 mothers of infants with a birthweight of less than 1250 g were recruited and followed up for a 5-week period post delivery. 15 were allocated to Group 1 using hand expression, 15 to group 2 using the manual pump and 15 to group 3 using the electric pump. The exclusion criteria included: contraindications to breastfeeding, breast malformation or reductive breast surgery, severe maternal diseases and multiple pregnancy. University Hospital in Brazil
Interventions	Mothers were assigned for randomisation into 1 of 3 groups. Group 1 - hand expression; group 2 - manual pump (Medela Caricia®); group 3 - electric pump (double collection Medela Lactina Select®). Verbal instructions and a practical explanation were provided about standardised hygienic procedures, milk collection, home storage and transportation of the expressed breast milk. All the equipment to collect and transport the expressed breast milk was donated to the study participants
Outcomes	Indications of adverse effects: description of any maternal breast complications. assessment of expressed milk for Dornic acidity (bacterial activity), off-flavour or foreign body; quantity of milk: mean diary volume of expressed breast milk; nutrient quality: sodium,

	potassium, protein concentration and mean energy content. Other outcomes, not included in this review: assessments by State-trait Anxiety Inventory; time of first expression in hours post delivery (mean 22.2 to 24.5 hours) and average number of expressions per day (mean 2.9 to 3.4)
Notes	Conference poster. Author provided extensive information in addition to the published abstract which has been used in this review Non-commercial funding from the Fundacao de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado de Sao Paulo - Foundation for Research Support of Sao Paulo State (FAPESP)

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Information on the details of the actual sequence generation have not been provided
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	"assignments were held in sealed envelopes prepared by a member of the research team and it was opened at the moment of randomisation". . . "Assignments were randomised by blocks of three. Mothers were .... randomised according to the order of birth to one of three groups using sequential sealed opaque envelope"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	45 mothers who met the inclusion criteria agreed to participate, 1 of which was excluded because she used her own pump following discharge from hospital not the allocated pump. 44 participants adhered to full protocol. 9 mothers were lost to follow-up There were missing samples in assessments of energy content and Dornic acidity, estimated to be 68% to 89% of what would be expected if 6 samples were received from all trialists in each of the 3 groups There was a higher numbers of missing samples in tests for sodium, potassium and protein: 60% to 70% of what would be expected if 6 samples were received from all trialists in each of the 3 groups.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	This study is not yet published.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.

Pessoto 2010 (*Continued*)

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Abstract states "not blinded study". Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	"Bottles of expressed milk were weighted by an employee blinded to the group". No information about any blinding of assessors of other outcomes

Pittard 1991

Methods	Cross-over RCT to examine bacterial contamination of breast milk obtained through manual or electric expression and stored in clean or sterile containers
Participants	16 healthy nursing mothers recruited within 6 to 171 days postnatal, mix of preterm infants with mother regularly expressing and full term infants feeding at the breast. USA
Interventions	4 arms to the study with one sample by each method Arm 1: manual expression into clean containers. Arm 2: manual expression into sterile containers. Arm 3: electric pump (Medela) expression into clean containers Arm 4: electric pump expression into sterile containers.
Outcomes	Bacterial colony forming units (CFU)/mL in expressed milk.
Notes	Data presented in paper as a bar chart showing number of specimens with less than or greater than 10,000 CFU/mL and not suitable for inclusion in the analysis. Results reported as: "The number of milk specimens containing $>10^4$ CFU/mL was not different between those collected in clean versus sterile containers or between those collected with a manual versus a mechanical technique". Attempts to contact trialist were not successful

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	'Card selection technique'. No additional information on 'card selection technique' was given in the paper and we were unable to make contact with the lead author
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information given.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given.

Pittard 1991 (*Continued*)

Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes reported in the study design are reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	No inclusion/ exclusion criteria given.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given but due to study design this would not have been possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given.

Prime 2012

Methods	Cross-over RCT comparing simultaneously (SIM) and sequentially (SEQ) technique with an electric breast pump (Symphony)
Participants	31 healthy breastfeeding mothers with an established milk supply with no concerns about their milk production prior to starting study
Interventions	Compare SIM and sequentially SEQ breast-milk expression with an electric breast pump (Symphony) at one pumping session for each method. Up to five weeks between methods studied and there was no prescribed interval between feeding at the breast or pumping and the test session
Outcomes	Time to rst recorded milk ow (seconds); total milk yield (g) at 15 minutes, which were outcomes for this review, plus percentage of total milk yield at 2, 5 and 10 minutes; time (seconds) to 50% and 80% of milk yield; cream content of first 1mL of milk, in the "bulk of the milk" and as "last milk" in a restricted pumping session of 15 minutes after milk flow commenced; number of milk ejections; percentage of available milk removed at 15 min, which are not outcomes of this review. The overall difference between cream content between simultaneous and sequential pumping was only reported descriptively. Reported as group differences, not between individual difference
Notes	In 2010 author stated that the study was observational with a cross-over element (so was excluded from 2011 review). Study was published as a RCT in 2012. Author was contacted in 2013 and replied that study is now considered a RCT

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	High risk	List was predetermined and when the participate arrived to take part in the study was assigned the next available space. Odd numbered participates would simultaneously express first and even numbered par-

Prime 2012 (*Continued*)

		ticipates would sequentially express first
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	High risk	No information given in the paper.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Author reports no incomplete data.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes listed in study design are reported.
Other bias	Unclear risk	No prescribed time interval between previous breastfed or expression and study visit. The study population could have been participating on more than 1 breastfeeding research study
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given but due to study design this would not have been possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given.

Rasmussen 2011

Methods	RCT comparing a manual to an electric pump among obese mothers as a part of the Bassett Improving Breastfeeding Study (BIBS). 2 protocols reported in 1 paper with only BIBS 2 relevant to this review
Participants	Pregnant women who at the time of enrolment were obese with a body mass index > 29 kg/m^2, over 19 years of age, carrying a single fetus and who then gave birth to term healthy infant who was ever put to the breast and available for telephone follow-up. 39 enrolled and randomised, 5 excluded before or immediately at delivery = 34. USA
Interventions	Mothers (n = 12) received a manual (Medela Harmony) or electric pump (n = 13) (Medela Symphony), to stimulate their lactation, for 10-14 days or no pump provided (usual care) n = 12. Written instructions to pump after 5 nursing sessions every day for 10 minutes at each breast until "milk came in" or infant 5 days old. Manual pump group could keep pump, electric pumps were collected by 14 days postpartum
Outcomes	Timing of lactogenesis 2, feeding method at 30 and 90 days, duration of exclusive breastfeeding. Pumping satisfaction questionnaire. Between pumps and either pump vs no pump comparisons
Notes	Author provided further information. "randomisation failed to distribute mothers of differing body mass index adequately among the treatment groups... in future studies of obese women, stratified randomisation may be necessary."

	Electric pumps were donated by Medela, Inc. Reply from author: "No competing financial interests exist."

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	"We used a random number table to generate this."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Withdrawals accounted for in published paper.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No evidence of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Research assistants (collecting data) did not know the participants' assigned treatment group

Slusher 2007

Methods	RCT comparing hand expression, manual and electric pumps.
Participants	72 mothers enrolled and 65 mothers completed the study (90%). 7 mothers requested to stop pumping and their reasons were provided in additional response of author. Hand expression (standard care) = 19 (all completed study); electric pump = 24 (data for 22 - 91.6%); pedal-operated pump = 29 (data for 24 - 82.7%). Inclusion criteria were mothers of infants unable to breastfeed directly due to prematurity or illness and expected to be unable to breastfeed for at least 1 week. Entered study within 2 days of birth. Mothers resided in the hospital during the study period and had unrestricted physical contact with their infants. Peer and professional support were available. Hospital had a reliable electric supply though surrounding community did not. 1 hospital in Nigeria and 1 hospital in Kenya
Interventions	Control group taught hand expression techniques by a group of trained nurses and 1 of the research team. All mothers pumped/expressed for a minimum of 6 days and a maximum of 10 days. All mothers had completed the study by postnatal day 13. Breast milk volumes were measured and recorded at each pumping session. No time limits on pumping. Instructed to pump at 2-3 hour intervals and to continue until milk droplets

	ceased flowing. Milk was not stored. It was either given immediately to the infant or discarded. Electric pump was a double-collection Medela Lactina. Pedal pump was a double collection pedal operated version of the Lactina
Outcomes	Quantity of milk expressed.
Notes	Additional information provided by author on economic aspects and the mothers' reasons for dropout. Pumping equipment was donated by Medela USA

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Random number table.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Additional information provided by author on missing data and the mothers' reasons withdrawal
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Reasons for drop-out and economic aspects of pump availability in low-income country not reported in article
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information.

Stellwagen 2010

Methods	RCT comparing the effect of the use of hand pumping in addition to the use of an electric pump in mothers of VLBW
Participants	42 mothers were enrolled, of which 34 provided milk samples. The mean gestational age of the infants was 27.5 weeks and mean birthweight was 924 g. USA
Interventions	All mothers were given a hospital grade pump and educated about the importance of human milk. All received lactation support. The intervention group (Hands on Pumping) used hand expression in combination with electric pumping and the control group used

	electric pumping only. The intervention group viewed a video (circumstances of this viewing not specified) demonstrating the use of hands on pumping to fully empty the breast
Outcomes	Volume of milk (g) in a 24-hour period. Results are reported on expressed milk volumes from day 16 to day 47 postpartum. Chan 2010 is another aspect of the same participants and reported on the energy, protein and carbohydrate content of the expressed milk
Notes	These conference abstracts briefly reported but the information was insufficient for use in this review. Lead trialist replied that no further data were available No information available on funding.

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	No information.
Other bias	Unclear risk	No information.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information.

Stutte 1988

Methods	Quasi-randomised control trial comparing effect of breast massage and no breast massage with women acting as their own controls
Participants	18 lactating women who routinely nursed their infants on both breasts. Infant age range 1 week to 1 year, mean 2 months. As each breast was separate, resulted in 36 experimental and 36 control participants. Exclusion criteria was breast engorgement and prior breast surgery or injury that might affect circulation or innervation
Interventions	Infants nursed and 2 hours later mothers pumped both breasts simultaneously with an electric breast pump while massaging 1 breast and using 1 breast as a control. The following day the procedure was repeated massaging the opposite breast. Massage was a

Stutte 1988 (*Continued*)

	specific technique taught and included in the published article
Outcomes	Volume of milk pumped and the fat content creamatocrit for the massaged and unmassaged breasts at one session of each protocol
Notes	Contact made with co-author Bowles. Other trialists with more expertise on the data are not available Pumps were loaned from Medela (Additional info).

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	"We flipped a coin to decide which breast to massage at the first session. At the second session the following day, the opposite breast was massaged" (additional information from trialist)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No concealment.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants completed the 2 parts of the study.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the intervention blinding of mothers or personnel was not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Lab technician examining samples was not aware of allocation (additional information from trialist)

Yi̧ it 2012

Methods	RCT comparing the effect of warming a breast prior to expressing milk on volume of milk expressed
Participants	Mothers had no history of breast surgery. Baby in NICU and was < 21 days old and unable to suck at the breast. Turkey.
Interventions	Breast compress made from gel (in the form of a single bra cup) was warmed in the microwave for 1 minute at 180 W and applied to 1 breast for 20 minutes. The mothers other breast acted as the control. Both breasts were pumped with an electric breast pump

Yiğit 2012 (*Continued*)

	for 15 minutes simultaneously
Outcomes	Amount of breast-milk produced by both breasts (study and control) over each day of the study. In total 6 expressions of milk over 3 consecutive days
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	'computerized randomization programme' determined random sequence generation
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information presented.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Only 1 mother withdrew from the study and her data were excluded
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes outlined in the study design are reported.
Other bias	Low risk	No indication of other bias.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information is given but due to study design this would not have been possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information given.

Zinaman 1992

Methods	RCT with cross-over comparing 4 different methods of milk expression/pumping
Participants	23 mothers exclusively breastfeeding their full-term healthy infants, 28-42 days postpartum. USA
Interventions	Milk collected by large electric pump (White River), battery-operated pump (Gentle Expressions), manual pump (Medela), hand expression (Marmet technique), and infant suckling. Four methods tested (three pumps and hand expression) within one week with a minimum of one method tested per day
Outcomes	For each method: oxytocin levels over a 60-minute sampling session (data available), serum prolactin levels over 60-minute sampling session (data not available), volume over 30-minute sampling session (data not available)

Zinaman 1992 (*Continued*)

Notes	Published paper reports mean net AUC and SEM for oxytocin numerically by method. Insufficient data were available to include in analysis; the average of each woman's difference in outcomes between the 2 treatments and its confidence interval was not reported, only reported the average result for each treatment over all women. Prolactin and volume graphically displayed not by numbers. Some additional information provided by author, however, additional numerical data no longer available. Study was supported by the Institute for International Studies in Natural Family Planning/US Agency for International Development

Risk of bias

Bias	**Authors' judgement**	**Support for judgement**
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Information on method of randomisation not available.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Method not described.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Insufficient information to judge.
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No indication of selective reporting.
Other bias	Unclear risk	No other bias apparent.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	Given the nature of the interventions evaluated, involving expressing or pumping milk, blinding of mothers or their care providers was generally not possible
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information.

AUC: area under curve
cc: cubic centimetres
CFU: colony forming units
EP: electric pump
g: grams
IBCLC: International Board Certified Lactation Consultant
kcal: kilocalories
mL: millilitres
MP: manual pump
NEC: necrotising enterocolitis
NICU: neonatal intensive care unit
RCT: randomised controlled trial
SCN: special care nurseries

SEM: standard error of the mean
SEQ: sequential single pumping
SIM: simultaneous double pumping
VAS: visual analogue scale
VLBW: very low birthweight infants
vs: versus
WIC: Women, Infants and Children (public health program)

Characteristics of excluded studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Study	Reason for exclusion
Chapman 2001	Does not compare methods of expression. Compares pump used with suction to placebo (pump without suction) to measure effect of breast stimulation by pump suction on lactogenesis
Chong 2007	Does not compare methods of expression. Compares pump use and non-pump use in regard to lactogenesis II markers
Fewtrell 2006	Does not compare methods of expression. More suitable for other Cochrane review - *see* Donovan 2005.
Flores-Huerta 1995	Observational design not RCT. Examined the effect on the duration, volume and composition when a nurse used a manual or electric pump on post-caesarian section mothers in 3 studies
Forster 2011	Involves antenatal expression of colostrum versus no expression
Fujimoto 2006	Not randomised. Mothers chose method - hand expression or electric breast pump
Green 1982	Previous version excluded as a cross-over design within first 28 days after birth to evaluate volume and fat content with 4 methods of milk expression. Re-assessed and no information available to determine if all women were randomised to all 4 methods of expression. Due to age of study contact authors were unable to provide any additional information to the paper
Junior 2008	Intervention was to provide a package of support to mothers of preterm infants. Additional or specific support related to milk expression is not mentioned as part of the intervention nor is milk expression listed as an outcome
Kent 2003	"Seven different stimulation patterns of the breast pump were tested in a predetermined random order." When further details were requested, author replied: "Our studies of milk expression have not been randomized controlled trials"
Kent 2008	Varing pump vacuums were tested in a randomised order. When further details were requested, author replied: "Our studies of milk expression have not been randomized controlled trials"
Lang 1994	Cross-over design within first 24 days after birth to examine nutrient (sodium) in milk when expressed by hand and by pump of mothers of infants in neonatal unit UK. Intention was to "try to randomly allocate as many mothers as possible" to commence a method for 6 days before changing method. Unclear if randomisation was carried out with all mothers and many mothers choose whatever method they preferred. Results reported without attention to any randomisation and included mothers from another non-randomised part of the study.

(*Continued*)

	After discussion with trialist the study was considered not suitable for inclusion
Lewis 2005	Compared pump versus no pump. Not randomised.
Mennella 2010a	Did not contain relevant intervention. Breast pumping was carried out to examine ethanol pharmacokinetics in lactating women
Mennella 2010b	Did not contain relevant intervention. Breast pumping was carried out to examine associations in family history of alcoholism, alcohol intake and prolactin levels in lactating women
Morton 2009	Examined the effect of combining hand expression and pumping. Observational design not RCT
Ohyama 2010	No randomisation in study design or methods. Alternate participants were assigned to 1 of 2 methods to use first and method alternated for subsequent expression sessions within the first 48 hours after birth to examine milk volume and maternal comfort
Pepino 2008	Did not contain relevant intervention. Breast pumping was carried out to examine ethanol pharmacokinetics in lactating women
Slusher 2012	Study is not an RCT. Published paper states mothers of infants in a special care nursery were assigned 1 of 3 methods of milk expression: double electric pump, single non-electric pump and hand expression using a "non-random sequential assignment"
Thompson 1997	Study does not mention "randomised" and thus excluded as trialist could not be contacted for clarification. This was mistakenly listed in the previous version of this review as a cross-over design within first 28 days after birth and thus excluded. Study examined bacterial counts in milk following breast cleansing techniques
Waller 1946	Does not compare methods of expression. Compares teaching antenatal hand expression of colostrum to no antenatal expression with regard to postnatal milk production, prevention of engorgement, and duration of breastfeeding
Williams 1985	Does not compare methods of expression. Compares 2 methods of obtaining milk samples for analysis
Zhen 1990	Does not compare methods of expression. Compares breast massage versus no breast massage and milk production and duration of breastfeeding. Mothers were directly feeding their babies, not expressing/pumping milk

RCT: randomised controlled trial

Characteristics of studies awaiting assessment *[ordered by study ID]*

Alekseev 1998

Methods	Unclear if a randomised control trial. It is stated that there is an experimental group but no information is given on allocation or randomisation
Participants	82 lactating women, aged 18-35 years old.
Interventions	Electric breast pump designed by the Insitute for Physiology, St Petersburg State University, Russia compared against manually expression only and a third group involved babies who were feeding from the breast without pumping
Outcomes	Quality of milk (milk volume); maternal physiological effect (prolactin, skin surface temperature)
Notes	Unsuccessful attempts were made to contact the author.

Heon 2011

Methods	"Pilot study of a randomized clinical trial to examine study design and feasibility"
Participants	"Forty mothers of preterm infants born at < 30 weeks of gestation and admitted to a neonatal intensive care unit." Montreal, Canada
Interventions	"The mothers in the control group receive usual care while those in the experimental group receive a lactation support intervention. The intervention has four components: an education session on the establishment and maintenance of an adequate milk supply, a telephone follow-up, a telephone help line and the loan of a double electric breast pump. In both the intervention and control groups, mothers kept a logbook of the frequency, duration and volume of their breast milk expressions."
Outcomes	Effect of support on milk volume, lipid content, frequency duration of milk expression
Notes	English language abstract of PhD thesis in French. Trialist is in email contact (with GB), full trial has not yet commenced (April 2014)

Yu 2014

Methods	Randomised controlled trial with cross-over design.
Participants	48 lactating women using their own breast pump. China.
Interventions	Assigned to a relaxation activity of a breathing exercise or listening to music for 10-15 minutes (women's own choice) first, or to no relaxation activity, then change over on the next day. Questionnaire used to measure relaxation and comfort
Outcomes	Amount of milk produced from both breasts with and without relaxation.Mother's view of her comfort
Notes	Requested further data from trialist via company which funded the trial and on whose web site it was reported

Characteristics of ongoing studies *[ordered by study ID]*

Dollberg 2013

Trial name or title	Impact of Different Electric Pumping Modalities on Milk Volume Production in Mothers of Preterm Infants
Methods	Randomised, cross-over.
Participants	Mothers of premature infants, estimated 250.
Interventions	"The study will last for 6 days. Each mother will express breast milk following two designed modalities in a random fashion, for two days each.The two designed modalities are: Complete pumping of one breast (first left) for 15 min, followed by complete pumping of the right breast for 15 min, until the breast is empty. Pumping both breast simultaneously for 15 min. At day one of the study, the mothers will follow the standard pumping modality in practice at our department. In between the two studied procedures at day 4 of the study, the mothers will again follow the standard pumping modality.On each day of the study, in the morning after the first expression of the day, a sample of 2 mL of pumped breast milk will be taken, and the total volume of the daily expressed milk will be recorded."
Outcomes	Volume, Fat, Protein and Carbohydrate concentrations will be assessed after each session of milk expression
Starting date	August 2013.
Contact information	Shaul Dollberg, dollberg@tasmc.health.gov.il +9723692590 Tel-Aviv Sourasky Medical Center
Notes	ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT01802047

Sisk 2013

Trial name or title	Education Study in Mothers of Very Low Birth Weight Infants.
Methods	"Allocation: Randomized, Endpoint Classification: Efficacy Study, Intervention Model: Parallel Assignment, Masking: Single Blind (Caregiver), Primary Purpose: Prevention. Test the effectiveness of breast milk expression discharge instructions in digital video disc (DVD) format for home use by mothers of very low birthweight infants on the dose and duration of mother's breast milk feeding in their infants compared to breast milk expression discharge instructions in printed format."
Participants	40 mothers. Inclusion criteria: - infant birthweight less than 1500 g; - maternal educational attainment less than/equal to 12 years; - maternal low-income status (Medicaid participant prior to delivery). Exclusion criteria: - non-English speaking; - illicit drug use during pregnancy.
Interventions	Randomly assigned to receive a breast milk expression instruction digital video disc (DVD) in addition to standard of care lactation education or assigned to receive written instructions in addition to standard of care lactation education

Sisk 2013 (*Continued*)

Outcomes	"In addition to comparing infant intake of maternal breast milk intake, pre and post intervention lactation and breast milk expression knowledge will be compared between groups and DVD viewing frequency and acceptability will be determined with a log and questionnaire to be completed by the intervention group and collected the first month after delivery."
Starting date	July 2010.
Contact information	Paula M Sisk, PhD Wake Forest Baptist Medical Center/Forsyth Medical Center, Winston Salem, North Carolina, United States Tel: 336-718-3277 psisk@wfubmc.edu. Mary Showalter, IBCLC Tel: 336-718-8233 mdshowalter@novanthealth.org
Notes	Status: Enrolling by invitation. Trialist Paula Sisk reply May 5, 2013: "study not yet completed, maybe for next update."

DATA AND ANALYSES

Comparison 1. Any type of pump versus hand expression

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Adverse effects for mother or infant	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 At least 1 expressed milk sample contaminated	1	28	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.89 [0.62, 1.27]
2 Transfer to feeding at breast	1	28	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.35 [0.61, 2.99]

Comparison 2. Any manual pump versus hand expression

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Adverse effects for mother or infant	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Bacterial level (dornic acidity)	1	142	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.20 [-0.18, 0.58]
2 Quanity of milk expressed	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Mean volume 6 days pumping (mL)	1	48	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-212.10 [-414.81, -9.39]
2.2 Volume of milk expressed (mL) on day 4-5	1	28	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-73.94 [-211.99, 64.11]
3 Nutrients (potassium, energy) in milk	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Potassium concentration mmol/L	1	118	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.20 [-2.36, -0.04]
3.2 Energy content Kcal/L	1	141	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-28.80 [-74.54, 16.94]
4 Nutrients (sodium, protein) in milk	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
4.1 Sodium concentration mmol/L	1	118	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.0 [2.21, 9.79]
4.2 Protein concentration g/L	1	118	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.30 [0.04, 2.56]

Comparison 3. Any manual pump versus any other manual pump

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quantity of milk expressed mL/24 hours	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Isis vs Harmony	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	4.57 [-13.42, 22.56]
1.2 Isis vs Little Heart	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	15.02 [-13.32, 43.36]
1.3 Isis vs Evenflo	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	30.49 [3.40, 57.58]
1.4 Harmony vs Little Heart	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	12.13 [-9.68, 33.94]
1.5 Harmony vs Evenflo	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	28.5 [12.11, 44.89]
1.6 Litle Heart vs Evenflo	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	15.47 [-75.30, 106.24]

Comparison 5. Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Maternal satisfaction (self-efficacy)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 "I don't want anyone to see me (hand expressing/pumping)"	1	68	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.70 [-1.25, -0.15]
2 Maternal satisfaction (with instructions)	1	68	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [0.05, 0.75]
3 Adverse effects for mother or infant	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Maternal breast pain on scale 1-10	1	68	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.02 [-0.67, 0.71]
3.2 Bacterial level (dornic acidity)	1	123	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.10 [-0.29, 0.49]
4 Quantity of milk expressed	3		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
4.1 Mean volume 6 days of pumping (mL)	1	43	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-373.1 [-585.11, -161.09]
4.2 Volume of milk on day 5 (mL)	1	25	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-224.62 [-508.97, 59.73]
4.3 Volume (cc) for 1 expression carried out at 12-36 hours postpartum	1	68	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.10 [-4.77, 0.57]
5 Nutrients (potassium, protein, nitrogen) in milk	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
5.1 Potassium concentration (mmol/L)	1	111	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.0 [-2.17, 0.17]
5.2 Protein concentration (g/L)	1	111	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.10 [-1.40, 1.20]

5.3 Total Nitrogen (mg/dL)	1	36	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-10.0 [-23.07, 3.07]
6 Nutrients (sodium, energy) in milk	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
6.1 Sodium concentration (mmol/L)	1	111	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.90 [3.22, 10.58]
6.2 Energy content (Kcal/L)	1	122	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	11.60 [-30.53, 53.73]

Comparison 7. Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quantity of milk expressed	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Volume of milk one expression (mL)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-15.00 [-38.33, 8.33]
2 Change in 24 hour milk production (g)	1	59	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	62.0 [-46.02, 170.02]
3 Time taken to express	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Minutes per one expression	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.0 [1.19, 6.81]
4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
4.1 Time (seconds) to milk ejection	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.0 [-21.23, 35.23]

Comparison 8. Any large electric pump versus manual pump

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Adverse effects for mother or infant	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Bacterial level (dornic acidity)	1	141	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.10 [-0.46, 0.26]
2 Quantity of milk expressed	3		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Mean volume 6 days pumping (mL)	1	53	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-161.0 [-388.90, 66.90]
2.2 Mean volume per day pumped (mL)	1	145	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-5.07 [-66.73, 56.59]
2.3 Volume of milk expressed (mL) on day 5	1	27	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-150.68 [-439.38, 138.02]
3 Time taken to express milk	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Mean time per day spent pumping (min)	1	145	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-20.27 [-28.30, -12.24]

4 Nutrients (sodium, potassium, energy) in milk	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
4.1 Sodium concentration mmol/L	1	121	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.90 [-1.76, 3.56]
4.2 Potassium concentration mmol/L	1	121	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.20 [-0.96, 1.36]
4.3 Energy content Kcal/L	1	141	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	40.40 [-9.12, 89.92]
5 Nutrient (protein) in milk	1	121	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.40 [-2.72, -0.08]
5.1 Protein concentration g/L	1	121	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.40 [-2.72, -0.08]

Comparison 9. Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quantity of milk expressed (one expression)	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Volume milk one expression (mL) (Whittlestone vs UNO pump)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	20.0 [1.28, 38.72]
1.2 Volume milk one expression (mL) (Whittlestone vs Swing pump)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.0 [-21.30, 31.30]
1.3 Milk weight from 15 minute simultaneous pumping (g)	1	58	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	22.80 [-1.47, 47.07]
2 Quantity of milk expressed (g/one day)	1	62	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-8.0 [-91.89, 75.89]
3 Time taken to express	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Minutes expressing each day (Symphony vs Avent Twin)	1	62	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-7.0 [-24.34, 10.34]
3.2 Minutes for one expression (Whittlestone vs UNO pump)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-6.0 [-8.81, -3.19]
3.3 Minutes for one expression (Whittlestone vs Swing pump)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.0 [-4.48, 0.48]
4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
4.1 Time (seconds) to milk ejection (UNO pump)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-26.0 [-54.49, 2.49]
4.2 Time (seconds) to milk ejection (Swing pump)	1	40	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-19.0 [-42.86, 4.86]

Comparison 10. Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quantity of milk expressed	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Total grams in weeks 2-5	1	49	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4298.94 [-1056.80, 9654.68]
1.2 Total mL per week	1	32	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	102.0 [-1268.57, 1472.57]
2 Time taken to express milk	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Hours per week	1	32	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-3.5 [-5.61, -1.39]
3 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Serum prolactin change, fold increase	1	32	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.7 [-3.22, 10.62]

Comparison 11. Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quanity of milk expressed	2		Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Volume at one expression (mL)	1	71	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	34.70 [9.51, 59.89]
1.2 Volume on day 1 (mL)	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	17.0 [9.27, 24.73]
1.3 Volume on day 5 (mL)	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	85.1 [63.13, 107.07]
1.4 Volume on day 10 (mL)	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	277.4 [207.75, 347.05]
1.5 Volume on day 14 (mL)	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	503.3 [410.76, 595.84]
2 Nutrients in milk (fat g/L) per day	1		Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Fat content on day 1 (g/L) per day	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	8.60 [3.66, 13.54]
2.2 Fat content on day 5 (g/L) per day	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	12.0 [5.17, 18.83]
2.3 Fat content on day 10 (g/L) per day	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	14.0 [2.25, 25.75]
2.4 Fat content on day 14 (g/L) per day	1	160	Mean Difference (IV, Random, 95% CI)	21.30 [-2.46, 45.06]
3 Nutrients in milk Creamatocrit % (one sample)	1	71	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [-0.83, 1.63]

Comparison 12. Any method plus specific instruction provided versus any method with no specific instruction provided

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Transfer to feeding at breast	1	60	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.0 [1.25, 3.21]

Comparison 13. Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quantity of milk expressed (mL from two expressions	1	72	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	4.82 [1.25, 8.39]
2 Nutrients in milk	1		Mean Difference (Random, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Fat content (creamatocrit)	1	72	Mean Difference (Random, 95% CI)	1.92 [1.02, 2.82]

Comparison 14. Any method plus warming the breast versus not warming the breast

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Quanity of milk expressed (mL)	1	468	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	11.94 [7.94, 15.94]
1.1 Expression 1	1	78	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	9.64 [-0.50, 19.78]
1.2 Expression 2	1	78	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	11.18 [3.00, 19.36]
1.3 Expression 3	1	78	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	11.10 [-2.48, 24.68]
1.4 Expression 4	1	78	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	12.39 [2.19, 22.59]
1.5 Expression 5	1	78	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	13.87 [4.31, 23.43]
1.6 Expression 6	1	78	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	13.02 [3.81, 22.23]

Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Any type of pump versus hand expression, Outcome 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 1 Any type of pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant



Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1 Any type of pump versus hand expression, Outcome 2 Transfer to feeding at breast.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 1 Any type of pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 2 Transfer to feeding at breast



Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant



Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 2 Quanity of milk expressed.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 2 Quanity of milk expressed



Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 3 Nutrients (potassium, energy) in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 3 Nutrients (potassium, energy) in milk

Study or subgroup	Hand expression N	Mean(SD)	Manual Pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Potassium concentration mmol/L							
Pessoto 2010	54	14 (3.1)	64	15.2 (3.3)		100.0 %	-1.20 [-2.36, -0.04]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**54**		**64**			**100.0 %**	**-1.20 [-2.36, -0.04]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.03 (P = 0.042)							
2 Energy content Kcal/L							
Pessoto 2010	61	601.7 (106)	80	630.5 (169.8)		100.0 %	-28.80 [-74.54, 16.94]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**61**		**80**			**100.0 %**	**-28.80 [-74.54, 16.94]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.23 (P = 0.22)							

Analysis 2.4. Comparison 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression, Outcome 4 Nutrients (sodium, protein) in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 2 Any manual pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 4 Nutrients (sodium, protein) in milk

Study or subgroup	Hand expression N	Mean(SD)	Manual pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Sodium concentration mmol/L							
Pessoto 2010	54	31 (12.1)	64	25 (8.1)		100.0 %	6.00 [2.21, 9.79]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**54**		**64**			**100.0 %**	**6.00 [2.21, 9.79]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.10 (P = 0.0019)							
2 Protein concentration g/L							
Pessoto 2010	54	12.1 (3.3)	64	10.8 (3.7)		100.0 %	1.30 [0.04, 2.56]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**54**		**64**			**100.0 %**	**1.30 [0.04, 2.56]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.02 (P = 0.044)							
Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 5.32, df = 1 (P = 0.02), I^2 =81%							

Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Any manual pump versus any other manual pump, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed mL/24 hours.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 3 Any manual pump versus any other manual pump

Outcome: 1 Quantity of milk expressed mL/24 hours



Analysis 5.1. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 1 Maternal satisfaction (self-efficacy).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 1 Maternal satisfaction (self-efficacy)



Analysis 5.2. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 2 Maternal satisfaction (with instructions).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 2 Maternal satisfaction (with instructions)



Analysis 5.3. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 3 Adverse effects for mother or infant.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 3 Adverse effects for mother or infant



Analysis 5.4. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 4 Quantity of milk expressed.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 4 Quantity of milk expressed

Study or subgroup	Hand expression N	Mean(SD)	Electric pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Mean volume 6 days of pumping (mL)							
Slusher 2007	19	419.6 (290.4)	24	792.7 (417.5)		100.0 %	-373.10 [-585.11, -161.09]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**19**		**24**			**100.0 %**	**-373.10 [-585.11, -161.09]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.45 (P = 0.00056)							
2 Volume of milk on day 5 (mL)							
Pessoto 2010	13	148.46 (167.42)	12	373.08 (476.14)		100.0 %	-224.62 [-508.97, 59.73]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**13**		**12**			**100.0 %**	**-224.62 [-508.97, 59.73]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.55 (P = 0.12)							
3 Volume (cc) for 1 expression carried out at 12-36 hours postpartum							
Flaherman 2012	35	0.8 (1.4)	33	2.9 (7.7)		100.0 %	-2.10 [-4.77, 0.57]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**35**		**33**			**100.0 %**	**-2.10 [-4.77, 0.57]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.54 (P = 0.12)							



Analysis 5.5. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 5 Nutrients (potassium, protein, nitrogen) in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 5 Nutrients (potassium, protein, nitrogen) in milk

Study or subgroup	Hand expression N	Mean(SD)	Electric pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Potassium concentration (mmol/L)							
Pessoto 2010	54	14 (3.1)	57	15 (3.2)		100.0 %	-1.00 [-2.17, 0.17]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**54**		**57**			**100.0 %**	**-1.00 [-2.17, 0.17]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.67 (P = 0.094)							
2 Protein concentration (g/L)							
Pessoto 2010	54	12.1 (3.3)	57	12.2 (3.7)		100.0 %	-0.10 [-1.40, 1.20]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**54**		**57**			**100.0 %**	**-0.10 [-1.40, 1.20]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.15 (P = 0.88)							
3 Total Nitrogen (mg/dL)							
Garza 1982	18	210 (20)	18	220 (20)		100.0 %	-10.00 [-23.07, 3.07]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**18**		**18**			**100.0 %**	**-10.00 [-23.07, 3.07]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.50 (P = 0.13)							

Analysis 5.6. Comparison 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression, Outcome 6 Nutrients (sodium, energy) in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 5 Any large electric pump versus hand expression

Outcome: 6 Nutrients (sodium, energy) in milk

Study or subgroup	Hand expression N	Mean(SD)	Electric pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Sodium concentration (mmol/L)							
Pessoto 2010	54	31 (12.1)	57	24.1 (6.8)		100.0 %	6.90 [3.22, 10.58]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**54**		**57**			**100.0 %**	**6.90 [3.22, 10.58]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.68 (P = 0.00024)							
2 Energy content (Kcal/L)							
Pessoto 2010	61	601.7 (106)	61	590.1 (130.2)		100.0 %	11.60 [-30.53, 53.73]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**61**		**61**			**100.0 %**	**11.60 [-30.53, 53.73]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.54 (P = 0.59)							
Test for subgroup differences: Chi^2 = 0.05, df = 1 (P = 0.83), I^2 =0.0%							



Analysis 7.1. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 1 Quantity of milk expressed



Analysis 7.2. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 2 Change in 24 hour milk production (g).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 2 Change in 24 hour milk production (g)



Analysis 7.3. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 3 Time taken to express.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 3 Time taken to express



Analysis 7.4. Comparison 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump, Outcome 4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 7 Any battery or small electric pump versus any other battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels



Analysis 8.1. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump

Outcome: 1 Adverse effects for mother or infant

Study or subgroup	Electric Pump N	Mean(SD)	Manual Pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Bacterial level (dornic acidity)							
Pessoto 2010	61	1.8 (1)	80	1.9 (1.2)		100.0 %	-0.10 [-0.46, 0.26]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**61**		**80**			**100.0 %**	**-0.10 [-0.46, 0.26]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.54 (P = 0.59)							



Analysis 8.2. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 2 Quantity of milk expressed.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump

Outcome: 2 Quantity of milk expressed



Analysis 8.3. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 3 Time taken to express milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump

Outcome: 3 Time taken to express milk

Study or subgroup	Electric pump N	Mean(SD)	Manual pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Mean time per day spent pumping (min)							
Fewtrell 2001b	71	53.26 (22.56)	74	73.53 (26.68)		100.0 %	-20.27 [-28.30, -12.24]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**71**		**74**			**100.0 %**	**-20.27 [-28.30, -12.24]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.95 (P < 0.00001)							



Analysis 8.4. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 4 Nutrients (sodium, potassium, energy) in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump

Outcome: 4 Nutrients (sodium, potassium, energy) in milk



Analysis 8.5. Comparison 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump, Outcome 5 Nutrient (protein) in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 8 Any large electric pump versus manual pump

Outcome: 5 Nutrient (protein) in milk

Study or subgroup	Manual pump N	Mean(SD)	Electric pump N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Protein concentration g/L							
Pessoto 2010	64	10.8 (3.7)	57	12.2 (3.7)		100.0 %	-1.40 [-2.72, -0.08]
Total (95% CI)	**64**		**57**			**100.0 %**	**-1.40 [-2.72, -0.08]**

Heterogeneity: not applicable

Test for overall effect: Z = 2.08 (P = 0.038)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Analysis 9.1. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed (one expression).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 1 Quantity of milk expressed (one expression)



Analysis 9.2. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 2 Quantity of milk expressed (g/one day).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 2 Quantity of milk expressed (g/one day)

Study or subgroup	Large electric		Small electric or battery		Mean Difference	Weight	Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	N	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
Burton 2013	29	221 (156)	33	229 (181)		100.0 %	-8.00 [-91.89, 75.89]
Total (95% CI)	**29**		**33**			**100.0 %**	**-8.00 [-91.89, 75.89]**

Heterogeneity: not applicable

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.19 (P = 0.85)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable



Analysis 9.3. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 3 Time taken to express.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 3 Time taken to express



Analysis 9.4. Comparison 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump, Outcome 4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 9 Any large electric pump versus battery or small electric pump

Outcome: 4 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels

Study or subgroup	Large electric N	Mean(SD)	Small electric or battery N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Time (seconds) to milk ejection (UNO pump)							
Francis 2008	20	68 (39)	20	94 (52)		100.0 %	-26.00 [-54.49, 2.49]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**20**		**20**			**100.0 %**	**-26.00 [-54.49, 2.49]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.79 (P = 0.074)							
2 Time (seconds) to milk ejection (Swing pump)							
Francis 2008	20	68 (39)	20	87 (38)		100.0 %	-19.00 [-42.86, 4.86]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**20**		**20**			**100.0 %**	**-19.00 [-42.86, 4.86]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.56 (P = 0.12)							



Analysis 10.1. Comparison 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping

Outcome: 1 Quantity of milk expressed



Analysis 10.2. Comparison 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping, Outcome 2 Time taken to express milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping

Outcome: 2 Time taken to express milk



Analysis 10.3. Comparison 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping, Outcome 3 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 10 Any method with a specified protocol of simultaneous versus sequential pumping

Outcome: 3 Maternal physiological effects - hormone levels



Analysis 11.1. Comparison 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique, Outcome 1 Quanity of milk expressed.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique

Outcome: 1 Quanity of milk expressed

Study or subgroup	Relaxation technique N	Mean(SD)	No relaxation technique N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI
1 Volume at one expression (mL)							
Feher 1989	38	90.1 (60)	33	55.4 (48.2)		100.0 %	34.70 [9.51, 59.89]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**38**		**33**			**100.0 %**	**34.70 [9.51, 59.89]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.70 (P = 0.0069)							
2 Volume on day 1 (mL)							
Keith 2012	117	39.6 (29.3)	43	22.6 (18.8)		100.0 %	17.00 [9.27, 24.73]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**17.00 [9.27, 24.73]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.31 (P = 0.000016)							
3 Volume on day 5 (mL)							
Keith 2012	117	177.2 (84.5)	43	92.1 (52.7)		100.0 %	85.10 [63.13, 107.07]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**85.10 [63.13, 107.07]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.59 (P < 0.00001)							
4 Volume on day 10 (mL)							
Keith 2012	117	511.3 (267.9)	43	233.9 (167.1)		100.0 %	277.40 [207.75, 347.05]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**277.40 [207.75, 347.05]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 7.81 (P < 0.00001)							
5 Volume on day 14 (mL)							
Keith 2012	117	821.5 (388.7)	43	318.2 (200.8)		100.0 %	503.30 [410.76, 595.84]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**503.30 [410.76, 595.84]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 10.66 (P < 0.00001)							

Analysis 11.2. Comparison 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique, Outcome 2 Nutrients in milk (fat g/L) per day.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique

Outcome: 2 Nutrients in milk (fat g/L) per day

Study or subgroup	Relaxation technique N	Mean(SD)	No relaxation technique N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI
1 Fat content on day 1 (g/L) per day							
Keith 2012	117	49.3 (13.7)	43	40.7 (14.3)		100.0 %	8.60 [3.66, 13.54]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**8.60 [3.66, 13.54]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.41 (P = 0.00065)							
2 Fat content on day 5 (g/L) per day							
Keith 2012	117	55.1 (31.9)	43	43.1 (12.2)		100.0 %	12.00 [5.17, 18.83]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**12.00 [5.17, 18.83]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 3.44 (P = 0.00058)							
3 Fat content on day 10 (g/L) per day							
Keith 2012	117	61.4 (61)	43	47.4 (13.3)		100.0 %	14.00 [2.25, 25.75]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**14.00 [2.25, 25.75]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.34 (P = 0.019)							
4 Fat content on day 14 (g/L) per day							
Keith 2012	117	67.9 (129.5)	43	46.6 (12.5)		100.0 %	21.30 [-2.46, 45.06]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**117**		**43**			**100.0 %**	**21.30 [-2.46, 45.06]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.76 (P = 0.079)							

Analysis 11.3. Comparison 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique, Outcome 3 Nutrients in milk Creamatocrit % (one sample).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 11 Any method with a specified relaxation technique versus no specified relaxation technique

Outcome: 3 Nutrients in milk Creamatocrit % (one sample)

Study or subgroup	No relaxation technique N	Mean(SD)	Relaxation technique N	Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
Feher 1989	38	7.2 (2.9)	33	6.8 (2.4)		100.0 %	0.40 [-0.83, 1.63]
Total (95% CI)	**38**		**33**			**100.0 %**	**0.40 [-0.83, 1.63]**

Heterogeneity: not applicable

Test for overall effect: Z = 0.64 (P = 0.52)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable



Analysis 12.1. Comparison 12 Any method plus specific instruction provided versus any method with no specific instruction provided, Outcome 1 Transfer to feeding at breast.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 12 Any method plus specific instruction provided versus any method with no specific instruction provided

Outcome: 1 Transfer to feeding at breast

Study or subgroup	Breastfeeding Program n/N	No program offered n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Ahmed 2008	24/30	12/30		100.0 %	2.00 [1.25, 3.21]
Total (95% CI)	**30**	**30**		**100.0 %**	**2.00 [1.25, 3.21]**

Total events: 24 (Breastfeeding Program), 12 (No program offered)

Heterogeneity: not applicable

Test for overall effect: Z = 2.87 (P = 0.0041)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable



Analysis 13.1. Comparison 13 Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage, Outcome 1 Quantity of milk expressed (mL from two expressions.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 13 Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage

Outcome: 1 Quantity of milk expressed (mL from two expressions

Study or subgroup	Not massaged breast N	Massaged breast N	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
Stutte 1988	36	36	4.82 (1.82)		100.0 %	4.82 [1.25, 8.39]
Total (95% CI)	**36**	**36**			**100.0 %**	**4.82 [1.25, 8.39]**

Heterogeneity: not applicable

Test for overall effect: Z = 2.65 (P = 0.0081)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable

Analysis 13.2. Comparison 13 Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage, Outcome 2 Nutrients in milk.

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 13 Any method plus breast massage versus no breast massage

Outcome: 2 Nutrients in milk

Study or subgroup	Not massaged breast N	Massaged breast N	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Random,95% CI
1 Fat content (creamatocrit)						
Stutte 1988	36	36	1.92 (0.46)		100.0 %	1.92 [1.02, 2.82]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**36**	**36**			**100.0 %**	**1.92 [1.02, 2.82]**

Heterogeneity: not applicable

Test for overall effect: Z = 4.17 (P = 0.000030)

Test for subgroup differences: Not applicable



Analysis 14.1. Comparison 14 Any method plus warming the breast versus not warming the breast, Outcome 1 Quanity of milk expressed (mL).

Review: Methods of milk expression for lactating women

Comparison: 14 Any method plus warming the breast versus not warming the breast

Outcome: 1 Quanity of milk expressed (mL)

Study or subgroup	Warmed breast N	Warmed breast Mean(SD)	Control breast N	Control breast Mean(SD)	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI	Weight	Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
1 Expression 1							
Yiğit 2012	39	30.28 (25.04)	39	20.64 (20.42)		15.6 %	9.64 [-0.50, 19.78]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**39**		**39**			**15.6 %**	**9.64 [-0.50, 19.78]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.86 (P = 0.062)							
2 Expression 2							
Yiğit 2012	39	28.07 (20.76)	39	16.89 (15.75)		23.9 %	11.18 [3.00, 19.36]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**39**		**39**			**23.9 %**	**11.18 [3.00, 19.36]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.68 (P = 0.0074)							
3 Expression 3							
Yiğit 2012	39	44.1 (32.46)	39	33 (28.59)		8.7 %	11.10 [-2.48, 24.68]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**39**		**39**			**8.7 %**	**11.10 [-2.48, 24.68]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.60 (P = 0.11)							
4 Expression 4							
Yiğit 2012	39	39.69 (25.45)	39	27.3 (20.2)		15.4 %	12.39 [2.19, 22.59]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**39**		**39**			**15.4 %**	**12.39 [2.19, 22.59]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.38 (P = 0.017)							
5 Expression 5							
Yiğit 2012	39	47.02 (23.01)	39	33.15 (19.98)		17.5 %	13.87 [4.31, 23.43]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**39**		**39**			**17.5 %**	**13.87 [4.31, 23.43]**
Heterogeneity: not applicable							
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.84 (P = 0.0045)							
6 Expression 6							
Yiğit 2012	39	45.07 (21.75)	39	32.05 (19.68)		18.9 %	13.02 [3.81, 22.23]
Subtotal (95% CI)	**39**		**39**			**18.9 %**	**13.02 [3.81, 22.23]**

(*Continued . . .*)

(. . . *Continued*)



ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 1. Expression and pumping methods

Type	Action	Equipment	Availability
Hand expression.	Hand action stimulates milk ejection reflex and compresses milk ducts	None.	Universal.
Hot jar (base cooled with cold cloth).	Cooling creates a vacuum so that the milk flows from breast (higher pressure) to the jar (lower pressure). Suction pressure may be difficult to control	Suitable glass jar, hot water, cold water, cloth.	Widespread.
Manual pump: compressing a bulb, pulling on 2 connected cylinders, or squeezing and releasing a handle	Negative pressure created by hand/arm action of the pump causes milk to flow from breast to pump. Suction pressure may be difficult to control. Some brands designed to reduce arm/hand fatigue. Some work on a 'draw and hold' principle rather than an even in-out action	Pump. Cleaning supplies. Most pumps have at least 3 parts. 1-handed pumps available and 2 pumps can be used for double pumping	Depends on market demand/distribution.
Battery pump: power provided by battery, manner of creating pressure may vary	Negative pressure at pump causes milk to flow from breast to pump. Adjustable suction pressure and cycling time in some brands. Some work on a	Pump. Batteries. New batteries may be needed after 2-4 hours use. Some have AC adapters available.	Depends on market demand/distribution.

Table 1. Expression and pumping methods (*Continued*)

	'draw and hold' principle rather than even in-out action	Cleaning supplies. Most pumps have at least 4 parts. Most are hand-held so weight of pump plus milk may be a concern	
Small electric: diaphragm pump.	Negative pressure created by pump action of the pump causes milk to flow from breast to pump. Adjustable suction pressure and cycling time in some brands	Pump. Electricity supply. Cleaning supplies. Most pumps have many parts. 2 collection sets can be used for double pumping for some brands	Depends on market demand/ distribution.
Large electric: piston pump, rotary vane pump, diaphragm pump. Power may also be provided by car battery or by foot treadle	Negative pressure created by action of the pump causes milk to flow from breast to pump. Pressure level may be controlled for some models. Some brands designed to reduce arm/hand fatigue. Some work on a 'draw and hold' or pulsating principle rather than an even in-out action	Pump. Electricity supply or other power source. Cleaning supplies. Most pumps have 10 or more parts. 2 collection sets can be used for double pumping.	Depends on market demand/ distribution. Larger pumps generally purchased by hospitals or rental companies for loan to mothers

Note:

- Some brands of pumps have a flexible breast cup that compresses the breast and some have a choice of sizes of breast cup. Multi-user pumps require high-quality cleaning procedures and frequent servicing.
- There is no one type of pump that is suitable for all mothers and all circumstances. To obtain quantities of milk by any method requires an effective milk ejection reflex.

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies

Study	Equipment/ method	Group (mothers of)	Length of trial	Funding	No. of participants	Percentage of participants with incomplete data (n)
Ahmed 2008	Pumps not compared, education and support intervention	Preterm infants < 37 weeks in neonatal unit	At least 4 education sessions	Not stated	60	None reported
Auerbach 1990 cross-over	SIM vs SEQ with Medela large electric pump	Healthy, full-term infants 5-35 weeks of age	1 expression per pump	Received support from the company whose	26	3.8% (1)

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies (*Continued*)

				product was tested		
Bernabe-Garcia 2012 cross-over	4 manual pumps compared: Avent Isis and Medela Harmony (with squeeze handle mechanism) and Medela Little Heart/Caricia and Evenflo (with cylinder-type mechanism)	Preterm infants	Each pump used at least 6 times for 1 day, over a consecutive 4-day test period, plus some use of an large electric pump	Received support from one company whose 2 products were tested. Non-commercial support described also	32	12.5% (4)
Boo 2001	Hand expression vs mother's own choice of manual pump	Infants < 1501 g birthweight in neonatal unit	While infants were in NICU	Non-commercial support described	28	3.6% (1)
Boutte 1985 cross-over	Egnell large electric pump vs Medela piston manual pump	Healthy, full-term infants mean age 3.2 months	24-hour period per pump	Non-commercial support described	9	0% (0)
Burton 2013	Medela Symphony large electric vs Philips Avent Twin electronic (small electric)	Preterm infants < 34 weeks in neonatal unit	Reporting on first 10 days of longer trial	Received support from the company whose products were tested	71	Not available
Costa 1989	Pumps not compared, hygiene procedure	Preterm infants in neonatal unit	1 expression	Received support from the company whose product were tested	65	1.5% (1)
De Carvalho 1985 cross-over	Differences in frequency of expression with Egnell large electric pump (> 4 times/day vs < 3 times/day)	Non-nursing preterm neonates in the newborn intensive care unit	Starting Day 5, 2 weeks with changed frequency on second week for some of the participants	Non-commercial support described	25	28 % (7)
Feher 1989	Pumps not compared, relaxation	Preterm infants in neonatal unit	1 expression	Non-commercial sup-	71	22.5% (16)

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies (*Continued*)

	tape			port described		
Fewtrell 2001a cross-over	Avent Isis manual pump vs Medela mini-electric pump	Healthy, full-term infants at home, 8 weeks old	1 expression per pump	Received support from the company whose product they were testing	60	3.3% (2)
Fewtrell 2001b	Egnell Ameda large electric pump vs Avent Isis manual pump	Preterm infants in neonatal unit	Not stated	Received support from the company whose product were tested	145	18.6% (27)
Flaherman 2012	Ameda Elite or Medela Lactina Select (both large electric) vs. hand expression	Healthy newborns	Single event	Non-commercial support described	68	Not applicable
Francis 2008	Compared Avent Isis IQ Uno (small battery/ electric); Medela Swing (small battery/electric); and Whittlestone electric (large electric)	Healthy term infants	60 days	Not stated	60	Not available
Garza 1982	Egnell large electric pump vs hand expression	Breastfeeding mothers and infants who were in good health	1 expression per method 2-3 days apart	Non-commercial support described	18	Not available
Groh-Wargo 1995	SIM vs SEQ with Medela large electric pump	Infants < 1500 g birthweight in neonatal unit	Minimum 4 weeks	Received support from the company whose product were tested	32	0% (0)
Hayes 2008	Electric and manual pumps, type not stated	Healthy mothers and infants at home	At least 6 months	Non-commercial support described	280	24.3% (68)

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies (*Continued*)

Hill 1999	SIM vs SEQ with Medela large electric pump	Infants < 1500 g birthweight or preterm in neonatal unit	6 weeks	Received support from the company whose product were tested	49	20.4% (10)
Hopkinson 2009 cross-over	Playtex Embrace small electric vs Medela Pump in Style small electric	Healthy mothers and infants at home	7 weeks and up to 6 months on other outcomes not included in this review	Received funding from 1 company whose product was tested	62 (34 in a subgroup to include hormonal analysis)	Milk volume change 4.8%(3) Fat conc. change 6.5%(4) Pump choice 1. 6%(1) Prolactin 11.8% (4 out of 34) Oxytocin 29.4% (10 out of 34)
Jones 2001 Protocol II cross-over	Protocol I: SIM vs SEQ with Egnell Ameda Electric Elite pump (large electric) Protocol II: Breast massage before pumping	Preterm infants in neonatal unit	4 days (Day 4-7 postpartum)	Received support from the company whose product was tested	52	30.8% (16)
Keith 2012	Control versus 3 types of relaxing recordings	Infants in neonatal unit < 38 weeks' gestation	14 days	Non-commercial support described	162	0%
Meier 2008 Protocol I: cross-over Protocol II: RCT and cross-over	Symphony large electric pump differing suction patterns	Infants with birthweight < 1250 g and /or < 32 weeks	Protocol I: 6 occasions over a 2-week period Protocol II: More than 12 days	Received support from the company whose products were tested	Protocol I: 35 Protocol II: 65	Protocol I: none reported Protocol II:0% (0) for satisfaction 30.76% (20) for total milk output 50.8% (33) for creamatocrit value
Meier 2012	Medela large electric 2-phase pump (Standard 2. 0) vs experimental breast pump suction patterns	Infants ≤ 34weeks' gestation admitted to NICU	14 days	Received support from the company whose products were tested. Non-commercial support described also	128	21.9% (23)

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies (*Continued*)

Mersmann 1994 cross-over	Compared Therapeutic touch to Mimic Therapeutic Touch to No Treatment	Non-nursing hospitalised preterm infants	3 or 5 consecutive days	No funding source listed	18	None reported
Parker 2012	Pumps not compared, time of initiation of pumping	Very low birthweight infants	42 days	No external funding	20	0% (0)
Paul 1996 cross-over	Compared manual pump (Medela "cylindric ...piston") and hand expression. Study done in 2 phases	Non-nursing infants in neonatal unit	Phase 1: postnatal days 4 & 5 Phase 2: postnatal days 4 & 5 and 8&9	Non-commercial funding described	Phase 1: 22 Phase 2: 14 (different people)	None reported
Pessoto 2010	Medela Caricia (manual) vs Medela Lactina Select (large electric) vs hand expression	Preterm infants < 37 weeks	35 days	Non-commercial funding described	45	22.2% (10) overall day 5 quantity: 11% (5) For nutrient quality and Dornic acidity, the missing proportions ranged from 11% to 40% depending on the analysis
Pittard 1991 cross-over	Hand expression vs Medela electric pump and clean vs sterile containers	Mix of preterm and full term infants 6-171 days old	All four arms occurred during one session	Funding not stated	16	No information given
Prime 2012 cross-over	SIM-v-SEQ technique with a large electric breast pump (Medela Symphony)	Healthy mothers with an established milk supply	Pumped twice over a 5-week period	Received support from the company whose products were tested. Non-commercial support described also	31	None stated

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies (*Continued*)

Rasmussen 2011	Medela Harmony (manual) or Medela Symphony large electric pump	Healthy infants (obese mothers BMI > 29 kg/m ^{2})	14 days	Received support from the company whose products were used	34	0% (0)
Slusher 2007	Hand expression vs double collection Medela Lactina large electric pump vs double collection foot pedal powdered Medela Lactina pump	Preterm or ill infants in special care unit	Minimum 6 days	Received support from the company whose product were tested	72	9.7% (7)
Stellwagen 2010	Pumps not compared, "Hands on Pumping" tested	Very low birthweight infants	47 days	Not stated	42	19% (8)
Stutte 1988	Breast massage before pumping	Mothers and healthy infants aged 1 week to 1 year	1 pumping per method a day apart	Pumps on loan from company (pump not being tested)	18 women reported as 36 breasts	None reported
Yi̇ it 2012	Warming the breasts before expression	Non-nursing neonates (<21 days old) in the newborn intensive care unit	3 days	Not stated	40	2.5% (1)
Zinaman 1992 cross-over	Hand expression Marmet technique vs double collection White River Electric large pump medium setting vs Gentle Expression battery-operated pump vs Medela Manu-electric pump used manually vs infant suckling	Healthy, full-term infants, 28-42 days old	1 expression per pump	Non-commercial funding described	23	Not available

Table 2. Overview of Included Studies (*Continued*)

	(SIM = simultaneous pumping SEQ = sequential pumping)		N/A = data not available

BMI: body mass index
NICU: neonatal intensive care unit
vs: versus

Table 3. Measures of milk quantity

Study	Measure reported	Time to pump Familiarisation and 'Washout' period in cross-over	Data included (for outcome of quantity)
Auerbach 1990	Mean volume/session (4 occasions)	Maximum time: 5 minutes per breast, then unlimited (until milk no longer dripped) No information on familiarisation or 'washout' period between pumps	Descriptive
Bernabe-Garcia 2012	Volume/24 hours with each pump	Until the milk flow ceased No information on familiarisation. Used a different pump on each of the four consecutive days	For analysis
Boutte 1985	Volume/24 hours for a single breast	"emptied completely"	Descriptive
Burton 2013	Total g/single test session median g/day total g/10 days	15-minute test period (plus other measures)	For analysis
De Carvalho 1985	Total volume/day	"completely empty" Appeared to use second method the week after first method with no 'washout' period	Descriptive
Feher 1989	mL/single session (once)	No information	For analysis
Fewtrell 2001a	Total volume/breast/single session (once)	Timed:10 minutes per breast 48 hours familiarisation before each test and the second pump was tested two to three days after the first	Descriptive
Fewtrell 2001b	Total volume/study mean vol/day	"5 minutes each breast, then increasing as tolerated" Up to mother to decide to use simultaneous or se-	For analysis

Table 3. Measures of milk quantity (*Continued*)

		quential sub-sample 10 minute per breast test period	
Flaherman 2012	Median volume/single session (once)	Timed:15 minutes simultaneous pumping or hand expression	For analysis
Francis 2008	Mean vol/single expression	1 breast once each day for 60 days	For analysis
Jones 2001	g/single session (once)	Continue pumping until the milk flow ceased One day of familiarisation with data collected following day, followed by one day familiarisation with other method then data collection next day	Descriptive
Garza 1982	Mean volume 1 breast over 2 samples	No information Samples were collected two to three days apart	Descriptive
Groh-Wargo 1995	Weekly average volume over 4-6 weeks	Timed: initially limited to 10 minutes then amended to no limit	For analysis
Hill 1999	Total weight of milk/week (over 5 weeks)	Minimum 10 minutes each breast and until the milk flow ceased	For analysis
Hopkinson 2009	24-hour volume by test weighing infants g/session	Once in morning and once in evening plus usual breastfeeding,1 x 10 minute session 2 weeks familiarisation for first method testing and then the other pump for several days before the second testing session	For analysis
Keith 2012	vol/day for 14 days	"about 10 minutes"	For analysis
Meier 2008	vol/session	Unclear, at least 15 minutes One session to familiarise in Protocol I and 5-7 days familiarisation in Protocol II	Descriptive
Meier 2012	Mean vol /day over 14 days cumulative output	For 15 minutes until the milk output was at least 20 mL from the 2 breasts combined, and on the days after that until 2 minutes after milk flow ceased	Descriptive

Table 3. Measures of milk quantity (*Continued*)

Mersmann 1994	/single session (once)	Continue pumping until the milk flow slowed or ceased	Descriptive
Parker 2012	Total volume on days 1-7, day 21 and 24	Until 2 minutes after milk flow ceased	Descriptive
Paul 1996	Mean volume/session (42 sessions)	Timed:15 minutes in total Method alternated at each expression/pumping session each day	Descriptive
Pessoto 2010	Total vol/1 day/week for 5 weeks	At least 10 minutes each breast or until 2 minutes after milk flow ceased	For analysis
Prime 2012	Single session (once)	Timed: 15 minutes for simultaneous pumping and 15 minutes per breast for sequential pumping timed from after milk flow started Up to five weeks between methods studied though there was no prescribed interval between feeding at the breast or pumping and the test session	Descriptive
Stellwagen 2010	5 weekly pooled 24 hour samples	"to fully empty breast"	Descriptive
Slusher 2007	Mean volume/day over 6 days	At least 15 minutes or until 2 minutes after milk flow ceased	For analysis
Stutte 1988	mL/single session (once)	No information	For analysis
Yi̧ it 2012	Mean vol/session (6 sessions)	Timed:15 minutes simultaneous pumping	For analysis
Zinaman 1992	Single session (once)	Timed: 30 minutes Four methods tested within one week with a minimum of one method tested per day	Descriptive

Table 4. Descriptive results provided by study authors

Study	Descriptive results provided by study authors
Maternal satisfaction with method	

Table 4. Descriptive results provided by study authors (*Continued*)

Bernabe-Garcia 2012	Significant difference was found between at least of the four pumps tested in this cross-over study and reported in a table in the published paper with median rating and range. Parameters of ease of use, comfort, pleasing to use, and overall opinion, (P < 0.001) and amount of suction (P = 0.007). Paper states :"Isis generally received better scores on the items easy to use, comfort, and overall opinion, followed by Harmony and Little Heart, which were equally accepted, and then by Evenflo. Scores for perceived amount of suction and pleasing to use were both more favorable for Isis, Harmony, and Little Heart than for Evenflo."
Hopkinson 2009	Mean rankings were reported in the paper. Standard pump was better for ease of assembly (P = 0.04) and in expectation of nipple irritation if continued to use (P = 0.034). No differences reported in nipple irritation between the pumps or for overall pump preference. Among the 61 mothers who selected a pump to keep for their own use, there was no overall pump preference reported. However, among the 51 mothers who had not been inadvertently issued with a special elastic bra, which permitted hands-free pumping and happened to fit the standard pump better, there was a preference for the novel pump (P = 0.05)
Fewtrell 2001a	More mothers reported satisfaction with the manual pump compared to the electric pump for comfort (73% versus 20%), pleasant to use (58% versus 20%) and overall opinion of pump used (69% versus 42%). No differences were found in ease of use (63% versus 65%) and amount of suction (67% versus 71%). Mothers were permitted to select a pump to keep and 64% chose the manual pump, with 34% selecting the small electric/battery pump (P = 0.049) and two women selecting neither pump
Fewtrell 2001b	The manual pump received better scores than the large electric pump for all items: ease of use (P = 0.03), comfort (P = 0.003), pleasant to use (P = 0.01), overall opinion (0.003), amount of suction (P = 0.05)

Table 5. Pumping frequency recommended and achieved

Study	Recommendation	Mean (SD) expressions I	Mean (SD) expressions II
Bernabe-Garcia 2012	Minimum 6 times/day	Isis 6.2 (0.3)/day	Little Heart, Harmony, and Evenflo 6.4 (0.6)/day
Burton 2013	"around 8 times per day"	3.6 (1.2)/day	3.5 (1.3)/day
De Carvalho 1985	Arm 1: express milk $\geq$ 4 times a day Arm 2: express milk $\leq$ 3 times a day	Arm 1: 5.7 (0.6)/day	Arm 2: 2.4 (0.6)/day
Fewtrell 2001b	6 times/day	3.96 (1.66)/day Electric Pump	3.74(1.15)/day Manual Pump
Groh-Wargo 1995	Minimum of 4 times/24 hours	28.4 (5.5)/week Sequential (~ 4/day)	28.8 (5.5)/week Simultaneous (~ 4/day)
Hill 1999	8 times/day	40.18 (8.77)/week Sequential (~5.7/day)	42.87(9.75)/week Simultaneous (~ 6/day)
Jones 2001	8 times/day	Mean 5 times/day over both groups Sequential	Simultaneous

Table 5. Pumping frequency recommended and achieved (*Continued*)

Parker 2012	At least 8 times per day	Early initiation: 5.7 (1.0)/day	Late initiation: 3.4 (3.8)/day
Paul 1996	Express 3 times a day for 15 minutes at 10 am, 12 pm and 2 pm	Achieved	Achieved
Pessoto 2010	At least 6 times/day	2.94 (1.51)/day Hand expression	3.02 (1.01)/day Manual Pump 3.39 (0.94)/day Electric Pump
Slusher 2007	2-3 hourly (8-12/24)	Not reported	

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. Search strategy for CINAHL

1 Milk Expression/
2 Breast Pumps/
3 Milk, Human/
4 milk.ti,ab.
5 breastmilk.ti,ab.
6 breast-milk.ti,ab.
7 express$ or extract$.ti,ab.
8 pump.ti,ab.
9 3 or 4 or 5 or 6
10 2 or 7 or 8
11 10 and 9
12 1 or 11
13 exp Clinical Trials/
14 clinical trial.pt.
15 (clinic$ adj trial$1).tw.
16 ((singl$ or doubl$ or trebl$ or tripl$) adj (blind$3 or mask$3)).tw.
17 randomi?ed control$ trial$.tw.
18 exp Random Assignment/
19 random$ allocat$.tw.
20 placebo$.tw.
21 Quantitative studies/
22 allocat$ random$.tw.
23 Placebos/
24 13 or 14 or 15 or 16 or 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23
25 12 and 24

Appendix 2. Methods used to assess trials included in previous versions of this review

Selection of studies

2008: Genevieve Becker (GB) and Mary Renfrew (MJR) independently read articles identified by the initial searches to determine inclusion or exclusion. GB and Felicia McCormick (FM) independently read articles identified by secondary searches. Two authors (GB, FM) used the data extraction forms independently and then jointly reviewed findings. GB entered the data into Review Manager software (RevMan 2003) and FM checked it.

2011: Genevieve Becker (GB), Fionnuala Cooney (FC), and Hazel Ann Smith (HAS) independently read articles identified by the initial searches and secondary searches to determine inclusion or exclusion, used the data extraction forms independently and then jointly reviewed findings. Data was entered by each author into Review Manager software (RevMan 2014) and then jointly checked and reviewed findings.

Assessment of methodological quality of included studies

2008: We assessed the method of allocation concealment used in each included study using criteria outlined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (Higgins 2006). Quality scores for allocation concealment were assigned to each trial, where A = adequate, B = unclear, C = clearly inadequate. We did not require a minimum quality score for inclusion. We carried out statistical analysis using RevMan 2003.

WHAT'S NEW

Last assessed as up-to-date: 21 March 2014.

Date	Event	Description
3 June 2014	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	Four additional comparisons were added. The results have changed though conclusions have not changed substantially
2 April 2014	New search has been performed	We have incorporated five new included trials and three new excluded trials. We amended the inclusion criteria to include cross-over studies within 28 days of birth and now include five such studies which were previously excluded. One study previously classified as not a randomised controlled trial was reclassified following further discussion with the trialist. Three trials are awaiting classification and two trials are ongoing This review is now comprised of: • 34 included studies involving 1998 participants, with 17 trials involving 961participants providing data for analysis; • 22 excluded studies.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 4, 2006

Review first published: Issue 4, 2008

Date	Event	Description
20 January 2011	New search has been performed	Search updated. We have incorporated 11 new included trials and nine new excluded trials. One trial is awaiting classification (Alekseev 1998) and one trial is ongoing (Fewtrell 2010) . This review is now comprised of: • 23 included studies (with 10 trials providing data for analysis); • 24 excluded studies. The results and conclusions have not substantially changed.
20 January 2011	New citation required but conclusions have not changed	New authors helped prepare this update.
6 July 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

For this update, Genevieve Becker co-ordinated the review, undertook the searches, obtained the papers and with Hazel Ann Smith screened the search results. Each study was reviewed, data extracted and quality appraised by the two review authors, with each review author taking the lead for a group of studies to contact authors for additional information. Hazel Ann Smith led related to quality and analysis sections and Genevieve Becker led related to drafting of other sections. Fionnuala Cooney provided review and advice as needed. All authors reviewed the final submission.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Genevieve Becker works in the general area of infant and young child feeding but not specifically connected with the topic of this review. She is not in receipt of any financial relationship with any commercial entity.

In October 2012 Hazel Ann Smith registered as a full-time PhD student to study the effects of infant's milk diet at two months of age on their growth in the first two years of life and their neurodevelopment at two years of age. Prior to her PhD studies, Hazel Ann Smith was a research midwife for a university from December 2009 to March 2012.

Fionnuala Cooney works as a specialist in Public Health Medicine. She received no funds for work on this review, has no relationship to any commercial organisation involved in research on this topic, and has no known conflict of interest to declare.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- G Becker: Unit for Health Services Research and International Health, WHO Collaborating Centre for Maternal and Child Health, Institute for Maternal and Child Health, IRCCS Burlo Garofolo, Trieste, 8232, Italy.

For part of the time of this update, G Becker was employed by the Unit for Health Services Research and International Health with time allocated to work on this review.

External sources

- Cochrane Fellowship - Health Research Board, Ireland.

Provided to G Becker for the original version 2008

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

Methods section updated in 2011 to reflect changes in the Cochrane *Handbook* (Higgins 2011) and Review Manager (RevMan 2014), including changes to the 'Risk of bias' tool.

In the protocol and review versions 2008 and 2011, we considered possible period effects in cross-over trials whereby a systematic difference can arise between the two periods of the trial, such as natural variations in the first few weeks after birth. The possibility of such a period effect was the rationale behind the selection criterion that any included cross-over study must have the cross-over commencing at least 28 days after birth.This criterion resulted in the possible exclusion of many trials involving preterm infants, the group most at risk from lack of mother's milk. Thus, the 2014 update included cross-over studies commencing within the first 28 days after birth, which would be then evaluated for any period effect.