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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness of urine culture and sensitivity analysis, urine dipstick testing, or urinalysis for urine testing in asymptomatic residents in long-term care?

2. What is the cost-effectiveness of urine culture and sensitivity analysis, urine dipstick testing, or urinalysis for urine testing in asymptomatic residents in long-term care?

KEY FINDINGS

Three non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of urine culture and sensitivity analysis, urine dipstick testing, or urinalysis for urine testing in asymptomatic residents in long-term care. No relevant economic evaluations were identified.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2014 December, Issue 12), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. Methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval to health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and economic studies. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2009 and December 8, 2014. Internet links were provided, where available.

The summary of findings was prepared from the abstracts of the relevant information. Please note that data contained in abstracts may not always be an accurate reflection of the data contained within the full article.
SELECTION CRITERIA

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

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Designs</strong></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.

Three non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of urine culture and sensitivity analysis, urine dipstick testing, or urinalysis for urine testing in asymptomatic residents in long-term care. No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, or economic evaluations were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

One non-randomized study compared the validity of multi-reagent strips with standard urinalysis for the early detection of urinary tract infection (UTI) in long-term care (LTC) residents. Urine samples were tested for leukocyte esterase and nitrite. Dipstick tests that were positive for leukocyte esterase or nitrite were not specific indicators of a UTI and had high false negative rates. The authors concluded that dipstick tests alone were not suitable for screening residents for UTI. A second non-randomized study compared dipstick analysis for leukocyte esterase and nitrite with urine culture. The authors suggested using both dipsticks and determined that, when both dipstick tests were negative, the presence of pathogenic bacteria could be ruled out with a negative predictive value of 88%.

One non-randomized study aimed to identify clinical features that could be used to identify UTI in non-catheterized LTC residents. Painful urination, change in urine character, and change in mental status were determined to be significantly associated with bacteriuria and pyuria.

No relevant economic analyses were identified.
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Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses
No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials
No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies
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No literature identified.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Non-Randomized Studies – Alternate Population and Setting


Multiple Study Designs


Review Articles


Additional References