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RESEARCH QUESTIONS  

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of oral care kits for patients in an acute care setting?  
2. What is the cost-effectiveness of oral care kits for patients in an acute care setting?  

KEY FINDINGS  

No relevant health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, or economic evaluations were identified regarding the clinical or cost-effectiveness of oral care kits for patients in an acute care setting.  

METHODS  

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2015, Issue 3), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2010 and March 4, 2015. Internet links were provided, where available.  

SELECTION CRITERIA  

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.
Table 1: Selection Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Patients in an acute care setting; subgroup ventilated patients in an acute care setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intervention</td>
<td>Oral care kits (kits provided daily for each patient; e.g., Sage Oral Care Kits)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comparator</td>
<td>Oral care provided using products not packaged together (selected individually by the nurse or healthcare provider) Kits compared with each other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>Clinical benefits: decrease or prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia; infection control; standardization of care Cost-effectiveness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Designs</td>
<td>Health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**RESULTS**

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, and meta-analyses are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and economic evaluations.

No relevant health technology assessment reports, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, or economic evaluations were identified regarding the clinical or cost-effectiveness of oral care kits for patients in an acute care setting.

References of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

**OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS**

No relevant literature was found regarding clinical or cost-effectiveness of oral care kits for patients in an acute care setting; therefore, no summary can be provided.
REFERENCES SUMMARIZED

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials
No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies
No literature identified.

Economic Evaluations
No literature identified.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses – Oral Care Interventions or Protocols for Prevention of Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia


Non-Randomized Studies – Oral Care Interventions or Protocols for Prevention of Non-Ventilator-Associated Pneumonia


Review Articles


Additional References – Conference Abstracts

Assessment of a Sage Oral Care Kit