

Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE) <<http://gateway.ovid.com/autologin.html>>

Choose a database

select a database to search select more than one database to search

-- To **begin a search**, click the name of the desired database.
 -- To **get more information** about a database, click the information icon: ce.
 -- Click the **select more than one database to search** button.
 -- [Logoff](#)

[Journals@Ovid Full Text](#) June 28, 2000
[EBM Reviews - Best Evidence](#) 1991 to March/April 2000
[EBM Reviews - Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews](#) 2nd Quarter 2000
[EBM Reviews - Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness](#) 1st Quarter 2000
[CINAHL](#) 1982 to May 2000

Click here to get started.

The Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness (DARE) is available to VUMC students and staff via the Ovid system. This evidence-based medicine resource is a full-text database that contains critical assessments of systematic reviews and meta-analyses in areas such as diagnosis, prevention, rehabilitation, screening, and treatment.

Searching DARE:

1. Enter your term(s) in the search box.
2. Check any of the appropriate limit boxes to refine your search (e.g., click the checkbox next to "prevention" if you are looking for information on prevention of sepsis)
3. Click "Perform Search."

EBM Reviews - Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness
<1st Quarter 2000>

Title
 Search Fields
 Combine
 Limit
 Basic
 Change Database
 Logoff

#	Search History	Results	Display
-	-	-	-

[Run Saved Search](#)

Enter **Keyword** or phrase:
 [Perform Search](#)

Limit to:
 Diagnosis
 Prevention
 Treatment
 New Reviews
 Recently Updated Reviews

Prevention
Limit

Results of your search: **sepsis.mp.** [mp=title, full text, keywords]

Citations displayed: 1-10 of 21

Go to Record:

[Citation Manager](#) • [Help](#) • [Logoff](#)

[Customize Display](#) | [Reset Display](#)

1. Center for Reviews and Dissemination Reviewers. **Vaginal antiseptics for hysterectomy : a review of the literature.** [Prevention]

Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness. Issue 1, January 2000.

[Complete Reference](#) • [Article Review](#)

2. Center for Reviews and Dissemination Reviewers. **Utility of antibiotic therapy in preterm premature rupture of membranes : a meta-analysis.** [Treatment] *Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness. Issue 1, January 2000.*

[Complete Reference](#) • [Article Review](#)

3. Center for Reviews and Dissemination Reviewers. **Steroid controversy in sepsis and septic shock : a meta-analysis.** [Treatment] *Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness. Issue 1, January 2000.*

[Complete Reference](#) • [Article Review](#)

4. Center for Reviews and Dissemination Reviewers. **Skeletal fixation of grade IIIB tibial fractures : the potential of metaanalysis.** [Treatment] *Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness. Issue 1, January 2000.*

Click "Article Review" to view the full-text of the assessment.

The citation for the meta-analysis being critically

Steroid controversy in sepsis and septic shock : a meta-analysis

[Treatment.]

Center for Reviews and Dissemination Reviewers

NHS Center for Reviews and Dissimination. University of York, York, U.K.

Lefering R, Neugebauer E A. 1995. **Steroid controversy in sepsis and septic shock : a meta-analysis.** *Critical Care Medicine* 23(7): pp.1294-1303.

[Browse Search Results](#) | [Titles Display](#) | [Main Search Page](#)

Outline

- [Author's objective](#)
- [Specific interventions included in the review](#)
- [Participants included in the review](#)
- [Outcomes assessed in the review](#)
- [Study designs of evaluations included in the review](#)
- [What sources were searched to identify primary studies?](#)
- [Criteria on which the validity \(or quality\) of studies was assessed](#)
- [How were the inclusion criteria applied?](#)
- [How were judgements of validity \(or quality\) made?](#)
- [How were the data extracted from primary studies?](#)
- [Number of studies included](#)
- [How were the studies combined?](#)
- [How were differences between studies investigated?](#)

Use these links to print, email, or save the full-text.

Output...

[Print Preview](#)
[Email Article Text](#)
[Save Article Text](#)

Links...

[Complete Reference](#)

[Help](#)
[Logoff](#)

History...

Steroid controversy in se...

The article review indicates what the original author's conclusions were, what the clinical implications of these results are, and also critiques the original work.

Author's conclusions [▲](#)

No overall beneficial effect of steroids in patients with septic shock was observed. However there is some evidence for a positive effect in patients with Gram negative septicaemia.

What are the implications of the review [▲](#)

There is no evidence of a beneficial effect of corticosteroids in patients with septic shock.

Record status [▲](#)

This record is a structured abstract written by CRD reviewers. The original has met a set of quality criteria. Since September 1996 abstracts have been sent to authors for comment. Additional factual information is incorporated into the record. Noted as [A].

Contact address [▲](#)

R. Lefering, Biochemical and Experimental Division, Department of Surgery, University of Cologne, 50923 Cologne, Germany.

CRD Comment [▲](#)

This is a clearly written review. A more extensive literature search may have revealed more relevant articles though contact with experts in the field should have revealed most of the relevant studies. Although the studies were assessed for quality no details are given of the factors used to assess quality. As the authors state there are problems with the methodology of the primary studies including the lack of consistent definition of septic shock, insufficient detail on the patient characteristics, mortality rates defined at