NEW VERSION OF THE COCHRANE HANDBOOK FOR SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS OF EFFECTS CONTAINS MAJOR REVISIONS

In February 2008, a new version of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Effects was released in an online format (Higgins & Green, 2008). A print version is expected by October 2008. This major revision includes a new format and many added features. New additions reflect an evolving understanding of quality within research evidence, and refinements to assure that Cochrane reviews continue to meet high standards and address a wide range of clinically important topics.

The Cochrane Handbook is the official guide for authors and readers of Cochrane reviews of the effects of health care interventions. This reference describes how reviews are prepared and maintained and outlines their standard content and format. Accepted methods for searching, selecting, assessing and analyzing studies and for interpreting and reporting conclusions are catalogued. Information about special review types and methodologies is also covered.

Several changes are of interest to Cochrane review readers. Of note is a change in the definitions and reporting methods for review updates. Changes to existing reviews will be classified as updates only if a new study search is undertaken; other changes are designated as amendments. Changes in authorship, major changes to a protocol, or changes resulting in new conclusions will generate a new citation in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR), where the nature of the change will be identified.

In the methods section of the handbook, a new tool has been developed to evaluate whether risk of bias is low, high or uncertain in the domains of randomization, allocation concealment, blinding, incomplete data, and selective outcome reporting in included studies.

In the section devoted to special topics, new areas of inquiry are addressed. Because not all topics of clinical interest are amenable to randomized study designs, non-randomized studies will be included in future Cochrane reviews, with recognition of the increased risk for systematic error and special attention to methods for detecting and accounting for selection bias and confounders. The new handbook also calls for greater analysis and reporting of adverse effects of treatments. Finally, Cochrane overviews of reviews are planned, to compile and summarize available reviews of multiple interventions aimed at a single condition or problem.

The changes and new additions are summarized in a pdf document that is available from The Cochrane Collaboration Website at: http://www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook/
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A systematic review of 32 qualitative and quantitative studies explored women's expectations versus actual experiences of pain and pain relief during labor. Women's involvement in decision making was also examined. Studies focused on pharmacological pain relief due to a lack of literature on non-pharmacological methods. Women's expectations and experiences in four areas were summarized: quality and severity of pain, use and effectiveness of pain medications, control in labor, and involvement in decision making. A discrepancy between women's expectations before labor and their experiences afterwards was found across all themes. Key findings were that women tended to underestimate the intensity of pain but that expectations shaped experiences to some degree; most women wanted access to effective pain relief but their expectations and actual use of medication were discordant; women wanted control over what was done to them and how they behaved in labor with some favoring control over pain and others favor-
ing control over care—degree of perceived control correlated with satisfaction; women rarely mentioned active decision making and reported the greatest influence from media and social ties.

Comment: This review supports the notion that pregnant women need improved education to develop realistic expectations about the full range of experiences and care options they may encounter in labor, along with support for decision making that includes anticipatory guidance and values clarification.


This systematic review and appraisal compared the effectiveness of neonatal antibiotic prophylaxis versus monitoring and selective treatment for asymptomatic newborns with known risk factors for group B streptococcal infection. It evaluated two systematic reviews comprising three randomized controlled trials. Risk factors for group B streptococcal infection in the studies included: confirmed maternal group B streptococcal infection or colonization, intrapartum fever, prolonged rupture of membranes greater than 18 hours or chorio-amnionitis/amnionitis, and low birthweight or prematurity. None of the trials found a significant increase in the incidence of disease or rate of mortality associated with monitoring and selective antibiotic treatment of neonates based on clinical or laboratory evidence of infection. Two of these trials were of poor quality with potentially insufficient power to detect important differences, while one was of moderate quality.

Comment: Because the incidence of neonatal group B streptococcal disease is very low, large sample sizes are needed to detect differences in outcomes of treatment strategies. However, routine antibiotic prophylaxis of at-risk neonates introduces potential harms including anaphylaxis and increased antibiotic resistance, and according to this review may be no more effective than selective treatment based on indication of infection.


Data from 45 observational studies were pooled and reanalyzed to assess the magnitude and persistence of protective effects of oral contraceptive pill (OCP) use on ovarian cancer. The analysis showed a 27% overall decrease in the relative risk of ovarian cancer for women who had ever used OCPs compared to controls. The dose of estrogen did not affect the reduction of risk. Longer use of OCPs conferred greater protection. These effects persisted for over 30 years, diminishing slowly such that the proportional risk reduction ranged from 29% for women who had discontinued OCPs 10 years ago, to 15% for those who stopped 20–29 years ago. The protective effects did not vary significantly after controlling for demographic and medical risk factors for ovarian cancer. The rate of mucinous ovarian tumors was unaffected by OCP use.

Comment: This pooled analysis provides new information about the scope of protection from ovarian cancer associated with OCP use. The results suggest that 200,000 cases may have already been prevented over the last 50 years. Since OCP use continues to rise, this public health benefit of OCP use can be expected to increase over time.
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