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Research Questions

1. What is the clinical effectiveness on the use for a trial of void in gynecological surgery patients?

2. What are the evidence-based guidelines on the use for a trial of void in gynecological surgery patients?

Key Findings

Two non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness on the use for a trial of void in gynecological surgery patients.

Methods

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, CINAHL, The Cochrane Library (2018, 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, 2013 and March 21, 2018. 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>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1: Selection Criteria</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intervention</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Comparators**           | Q1: Other comparators (including bladder suspension), no comparator (safety)  
                          | Q2: No comparator |
| **Outcomes**              | Q1: Clinical effectiveness (benefit/harm), safety  
                          | Q2: Guidelines or best practices, patient criteria for a trial of void |
| **Study Designs**         | Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, evidence-based guidelines |
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 evidence-based guidelines.

Two non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness on the use for a trial of void in gynecological surgery patients. No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews, meta-analyses, randomized controlled trials, or evidence-based guidelines were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Overall Summary of Findings

Two non-randomized studies (NRS)¹² were identified regarding the clinical effectiveness of trial of void in gynecological surgery patients.

One study showed that trial of void was positively associated with length of stay beyond the first day following urogynecological surgery (N = 263).¹ The second study showed that for patients who underwent pelvic floor repair surgery without concurrent incontinence, trial of void failure was significantly associated with a post-void residual volume of ≥ 150 ml.²

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


Guidelines and Recommendations
No literature identified.
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