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RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What is the clinical effectiveness and safety of ulipristal compared to other interventions for emergency contraception?

2. What is the cost-effectiveness of ulipristal compared to other interventions for emergency contraception?

3. What are the evidence-based guidelines regarding emergency contraception?

KEY FINDINGS

Three systematic reviews, three randomized controlled trials, two non-randomized studies, and four economic evaluations were identified regarding ulipristal compared to other interventions for emergency contraception. Seven evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding emergency contraception.

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, ECRI Institute, Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused Internet search. For research question 1 and 2 no filters were applied to limit retrieval by study type. For research question number 3 methodological filters were applied to limit retrieval to guidelines. The search was also limited to English language documents published between Jan 1, 2010 and Nov 25, 2015. Internet links were provided, where available.

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.
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>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comparator</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Outcomes</strong></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, economic evaluations, and evidence-based guidelines.

Three systematic reviews, three randomized controlled trials, two non-randomized studies, and four economic evaluations were identified regarding ulipristal compared to other interventions for emergency contraception. Seven evidence-based guidelines were identified regarding emergency contraception. No relevant health technology assessments were identified.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Health Technology Assessments
No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses


Randomized Controlled Trials


Non-Randomized Studies


Economic Evaluations


11. Thomas CM, Cameron S. Can we reduce costs and prevent more unintended pregnancies? A cost of illness and cost-effectiveness study comparing two methods of

Guidelines and Recommendations


See: Recommendation 9 Providing emergency contraception, pages 18-19


See: Interventions to Prevent Unintended Pregnancies


See: Emergency Contraception, pages 34-35


PubMed: PM22971457


See: 4.5 Emergency Contraception, pages 6-7
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APPENDIX – FURTHER INFORMATION:

Randomized Controlled Trials – Pooled Analysis of Pharmacodynamic Studies


Non-Randomized Studies

Usage Patterns


Qualitative Studies


Policy Statements and Clinical Practice Guidelines – Methodology Not Specified


PubMed: PM21121541

PubMed: PM21731419

Review Articles

PubMed: PM26390246


PubMed: PM26546020

PubMed: PM26287780

PubMed: PM24787486