

Elbourne D, Wiseman RREW

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Types of intra-muscular opioids for maternal pain relief in labour (Review)



Elbourne D, Wiseman RREW.
Types of intra-muscular opioids for maternal pain relief in labour.

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD001237.

DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001237.pub2.

www.cochranelibrary.com

i



TABLE OF CONTENTS

REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION	1
FEEDBACK	1
WHAT'S NEW	2
HISTORY	2
SOLIDCES OF SLIDDODT	-



[Intervention Review]

Types of intra-muscular opioids for maternal pain relief in labour

Diana Elbourne¹, Richard REW Wiseman²

¹Medical Statistics Unit, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, London, UK. ²Dept of Epidemiology and Population Health, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Health, London, UK

Contact: Diana Elbourne, Medical Statistics Unit, London School of Hygiene and Tropical Medicine, Keppel Street, London, WC1E 7HT, UK. Diana. Elbourne@lshtm.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group.

Publication status and date: Withdrawn from publication for reasons stated in the review, published in Issue 1, 2010.

Citation: Elbourne D, Wiseman RREW. Types of intra-muscular opioids for maternal pain relief in labour. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD001237. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001237.pub2.

Copyright © 2010 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION

May 2006

The 'Types of intra-muscular opioids for maternal pain relief in labour' review (Elbourne D, Wiseman RA. Types of intra-muscular opioids for maternal pain relief in labour. The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 1998, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD001237. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001237.) has been withdrawn from Issue 3, 2006 of The Cochrane Library because it is out-of-date.

A new protocol is currently being prepared by a new review team to update this review: Parenteral analgesics for pain relief in labour.

The editorial group responsible for this previously published document have withdrawn it from publication.

FEEDBACK

McIntosh and Alderson, April 1999

Summary

Types of outcome measures:

There are 23 outcome measures, and it is likely that at least one will reach statistical significance by chance alone. The table of comparisons is cumbersome, with one primary outcome listed 18th.

Methodological qualities of included studies:

It is unclear how concealment of allocation was assessed. All included trials scored 'A', but there is no information about how this judgement was made, either under 'methods' or in the table of 'characteristics of included studies'. Post randomisation exclusions are said to be in the table: characteristics of included studies and are described as 'common' in the dicscussion, but are only mentioned for two trials, Borglin 1971 and Levy 1971.

Results

In 'methods' the results are described as intention to treat, but for several trials women have been excluded from the analyses. Ten women are missing from pentazocine versus pethidine Levy 1971, 17 from Mowat 1970, and one from some outcomes in Husslein 1987.

The 7 trials of meptazinol versus pethidine are described as not having significant heterogeneity. How was this concluded as no outcome presented data from all the trials? For pentazocine versus pethidine, the reviewers comment there was 'no convincing evidence of a difference between the drugs in any of the substantive outcomes considered'. It should be pointed out that some outcomes were only reported for a proportion of trials, and the substantive outcomes should be listed.

Conclusions:



What would be the characteristics of a 'well-designed and suitably sized trial', as recommended by the reviewers?

Characteristics of excluded studies:

It would be more helpful to put Fairlie 1992 in 'studies awaiting assessment'

Reply

A response from the reviewer will be published as soon as it is available.

Contributors

Summary of comments from Heather McIntosh and Phil Alderson, April 1999.

WHAT'S NEW

Date	Event	Description
21 August 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 2, 1998 Review first published: Issue 4, 1998

Date	Event	Description
22 May 2006	Amended	Review withdrawn from publication in <i>The Cochrane Library</i> 2006, Issue 3.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

· No sources of support supplied

External sources

• Nuffield Provincial Hospitals Trust, London, UK.