

digital examination versus Endoanal ultrasound for fecal incontinence in FI patients

Review information

Authors

[Empty name]¹

¹[Empty affiliation]

Citation example: [Empty name]. digital examination versus Endoanal ultrasound for fecal incontinence in FI patients. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews [Year], Issue [Issue].

Contact person

[Empty name]

Dates

Assessed as Up-to-date:	
Date of Search:	
Next Stage Expected:	
Protocol First Published:	Not specified
Review First Published:	Not specified
Last Citation Issue:	Not specified

What's new

Date / Event	Description
--------------	-------------

History

Date / Event	Description
--------------	-------------

Abstract

Background

Objectives

Search methods

Selection criteria

Data collection and analysis

Main results

Authors' conclusions

Plain language summary

[Summary title]

[Summary text]

Background

Target condition being diagnosed

Index test(s)

Clinical pathway

Prior test(s)

Role of index test(s)

Alternative test(s)

Rationale

Objectives

Secondary objectives

Methods

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

Participants

Index tests

Target conditions

Reference standards

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

Searching other resources

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Data extraction and management

Assessment of methodological quality

Statistical analysis and data synthesis

Investigations of heterogeneity

Sensitivity analyses

Assessment of reporting bias

Results

Results of the search

Methodological quality of included studies

Findings

Discussion

Summary of main results

Strengths and weaknesses of the review

Applicability of findings to the review question

Authors' conclusions

Implications for practice

Implications for research

Acknowledgements

Contributions of authors

Declarations of interest

Differences between protocol and review

Published notes

Characteristics of studies

Characteristics of included studies

Dobben AC 2007

Patient Selection

A. Risk of Bias	
Patient Sampling	Cohort, prospective patients (n= 312, 90% women) with FI
Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled?	Yes
Was a case-control design avoided?	Yes
Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions?	Yes
Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?	Low risk

B. Concerns regarding applicability	
Patient characteristics and setting	The majority was female but patients are only included if they have been through conservative treatment with no effect. This might cause a risk of bias
Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?	Unclear concern

Index Test

Index tests	Digital anal examination
-------------	--------------------------

All tests

A. Risk of Bias	
Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard?	Unclear
If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified?	
Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?	Unclear risk

B. Concerns regarding applicability	
Are there concerns that the index test, its conduct, or interpretation differ from the review question?	Low concern

Reference Standard

A. Risk of Bias	
Target condition and reference standard(s)	Standard methods detecting changed structure or disruption
Is the reference standards likely to correctly classify the target condition?	Yes
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index tests?	Unclear
Could the reference standard, its conduct, or its interpretation have introduced bias?	Unclear risk

B. Concerns regarding applicability	
Are there concerns that the target condition as defined by the reference standard does not match the question?	Unclear concern

Flow and Timing

A. Risk of Bias	
Flow and timing	Eleven patients dropped out. Reasons not described. Not possible to conclude anything about any timelapse between the different examinations
Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard?	Unclear
Did all patients receive the same reference standard?	Yes
Were all patients included in the analysis?	Yes
Could the patient flow have introduced bias?	Low risk

Notes

Notes	The Netherlands, Financial support was granted by The Netherlands Organization for Health Research and Development ZON MW. Grant 945-01-013, 2001.
--------------	--

Jeppson PC 2012

Patient Selection

A. Risk of Bias	
Patient Sampling	Electronic medical records of all patients who presented to a tertiary care urogynecology clinic and evaluated by endoanal ultrasound were reviewed. A total of 112 patients were evaluated for fecal incontinence and received endoanal ultrasound during the study period. After the exclusion criteria were reviewed, 74

patients were included as the subjects of this report.	
Was a consecutive or random sample of patients enrolled?	Unclear
Was a case-control design avoided?	Yes
Did the study avoid inappropriate exclusions?	Unclear
Could the selection of patients have introduced bias?	Unclear risk

B. Concerns regarding applicability	
Patient characteristics and setting	After approval by the institutional review board, the electronic medical records of all patients who presented to a tertiary care urogynecology clinic and evaluated by endoanal ultrasound were reviewed. Records were reviewed from January 2000 through March 2009. Past medical and surgical histories were reviewed. Patients identified with a history of rectovaginal fistula, dementia, stroke, multiple sclerosis, inflammatory bowel disease, irritable bowel syndrome, chronic neurologic conditions, prior rectal/anal surgery such as hemorrhoidectomy, rectal prolapse repair, or sphincteroplasty—or the absence of standardized DRE at the time of evaluation were excluded.
Are there concerns that the included patients and setting do not match the review question?	Low concern

Index Test

Index tests	Digital anal examination
-------------	--------------------------

All tests

A. Risk of Bias	
Were the index test results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the reference standard?	No
If a threshold was used, was it pre-specified?	
Could the conduct or interpretation of the index test have introduced bias?	Unclear risk

B. Concerns regarding applicability	
Are there concerns that the index test, its conduct, or interpretation differ from the review question?	Low concern

Reference Standard

A. Risk of Bias	
Target condition and reference standard(s)	Endoanal ultrasound
Is the reference standards likely to correctly classify the target condition?	Yes
Were the reference standard results interpreted without knowledge of the results of the index tests?	No
Could the reference standard, its conduct, or its interpretation have introduced bias?	Low risk

B. Concerns regarding applicability	
Are there concerns that the target condition as defined by the reference standard does not match the question?	Low concern

Flow and Timing

A. Risk of Bias	
Flow and timing	53 days (SD 227) between digital anal examination and endoanal ultrasound
Was there an appropriate interval between index test and reference standard?	No
Did all patients receive the same reference standard?	Yes
Were all patients included in the analysis?	Yes
Could the patient flow have introduced bias?	Unclear risk

Notes

Notes	USA, funding not described
--------------	----------------------------

Footnotes

Characteristics of excluded studies

Footnotes

Characteristics of studies awaiting classification

Footnotes

Characteristics of ongoing studies

Footnotes

Summary of findings tables

Additional tables

References to studies

Included studies

Dobben AC 2007

[Empty]

Jeppson PC 2012

[Empty]

Excluded studies

Studies awaiting classification

Ongoing studies

Other references

Additional references

Other published versions of this review

Data and analyses




Data tables by test

Test	P a r t i c i p e s a n t s

Figures

Figure 1

	<u>Risk of Bias</u>				<u>Applicability Concerns</u>		
	Patient Selection	Index Test	Reference Standard	Flow and Timing	Patient Selection	Index Test	Reference Standard
Dobben AC 2007	+	?	?	+	?	+	?
Jeppson PC 2012	?	?	+	?	+	+	+

 High	 Unclear	 Low
---	--	--

Risk of bias and applicability concerns summary: review authors' judgements about each domain for each included study

Sources of support

Internal sources

- No sources of support provided

External sources

- No sources of support provided

Feedback

Appendices