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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the comparative clinical effectiveness of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate oral rinse solutions versus hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia?

2. What is the clinical evidence regarding the safety of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate and hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions for ventilated patients?

KEY MESSAGE

No evidence was identified regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness or safety of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate oral rinse solutions versus hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia.

METHODS

A limited literature search was conducted on key resources including PubMed, The Cochrane Library (2012, Issue 3), University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, Canadian and abbreviated lists of major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. No filters were applied to limit the retrieval by study type. The search was also limited to English language documents published between Jan 1, 2007 and Apr 11, 2012. Internet links were provided, where available.

RESULTS

No health technology assessments, systematic reviews and meta-analyses, randomized-controlled trials, or non-randomized studies were identified regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness or safety of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate oral rinse solutions versus hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia.

Disclaimer: The Rapid Response Service is an information service for those involved in planning and providing health care in Canada. Rapid responses are based on a limited literature search and are not comprehensive, systematic reviews. The intent is to provide a list of sources of the best evidence on the topic that CADTH could identify using all reasonable efforts within the time allowed. Rapid responses should be considered along with other types of information and health care considerations. The information included in this response is not intended to replace professional medical advice, nor should it be construed as a recommendation for or against the use of a particular health technology. Readers are also cautioned that a lack of good quality evidence does not necessarily mean a lack of effectiveness particularly in the case of new and emerging health technologies, for which little information can be found, but which may in future prove to be effective. While CADTH has taken care in the preparation of the report to ensure that its contents are accurate, complete and up to date, CADTH does not make any guarantee to that effect. CADTH is not liable for any loss or damages resulting from use of the information in the report.

Copyright: This report contains CADTH copyright material and may contain material in which a third party owns copyright. This report may be used for the purposes of research or private study only. It may not be copied, posted on a web site, redistributed by email or stored on an electronic system without the prior written permission of CADTH or applicable copyright owner.

Links: This report may contain links to other information available on the websites of third parties on the Internet. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third party sites is governed by the owners’ own terms and conditions.
effectiveness of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate oral rinse solutions versus hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions or the safety of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate oral rinse solutions and hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia. Additional references of potential interest on 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia are provided in the appendix.

OVERALL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

No relevant literature was found regarding the comparative clinical effectiveness of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate oral rinse solutions versus hydrogen peroxide oral rinse solutions or the safety of these oral rinse solutions for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia, 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.
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses - efficacy of chlorhexidine gluconate


Randomized Controlled Studies - efficacy of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate


Review Articles


Additional References

Safety of 0.12% chlorhexidine gluconate