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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the evidence regarding the clinical effectiveness and safety of human papillomavirus (HPV) testing for primary cervical cancer screening?
2. What is the cost-effectiveness of HPV testing for primary cervical cancer screening?
3. What are the guidelines regarding HPV testing for cervical cancer screening?

KEY FINDINGS

Seven systematic reviews and meta-analyses and two evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding HPV testing for cervical cancer screening.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library, 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, and guidelines. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2011 and October 3, 2016. 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><strong>Population</strong></th>
<th>Adult women who are eligible for cervical cancer screening</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
<td>Testing for human papillomavirus (HPV)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
<td>Conventional cytology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></td>
<td>Clinical effectiveness, safety, test characteristics/accuracy, recommendations for screening</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Designs</strong></td>
<td>Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, evidence-based guidelines</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 evidence-based guidelines.

Seven systematic reviews and meta-analyses and two evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness, safety, and guidelines for HPV testing for cervical cancer screening.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses


Guidelines and Recommendations
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Previous CADTH Reports


Clinical Practice Guidelines – Methodology Not Specified


Economic Evaluation


Systematic Reviews – Combination Testing


Non-Randomized Studies

Qualitative Studies


Review Articles