

[Intervention] for [health problem]

Review information

Authors

[Empty name]¹

¹[Empty affiliation]

Citation example: [Empty name]. [Intervention] for [health problem]. 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

Description of the condition

Description of the intervention

How the intervention might work

Why it is important to do this review

Objectives

Methods

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

Types of participants

Types of interventions

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

Secondary outcomes

Search methods for identification of studies

Electronic searches

Searching other resources

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

Data extraction and management

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Measures of treatment effect

Unit of analysis issues

Dealing with missing data

Assessment of heterogeneity

Assessment of reporting biases

Data synthesis

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

Sensitivity analysis

Results

Description of studies

Results of the search

Included studies

Excluded studies

Risk of bias in included studies

Allocation (selection bias)

Blinding (performance bias and detection bias)

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)

Selective reporting (reporting bias)

Other potential sources of bias

Effects of interventions

Discussion

Summary of main results

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

Quality of the evidence

Potential biases in the review process

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

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

Markland 2014

Methods	RCT, randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled cross-over trial
Participants	Eligibility required that patients have at least one FI episode on a 7-day bowel diary.
Interventions	participants were randomized to receive either loperamide followed by psyllium or psyllium followed by loperamide.
Outcomes	FI episodes measured by 7-day bowel diary. The Fecal Incontinence Severity Index (FISI) and Modified Manchester Health Questionnaire (MMHQ) scores for condition-specific QOL.
Notes	USA, Abstract Funding: VA Rehabilitative Research & Development (RR&D), Career Development Award-2 Southeast Center of Excellence in Geriatric Medicine (SCEGM) through the John A. Hartford Foundation

Risk of bias table

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	not described
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	not described
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Low risk	No apparent risk of bias
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)	Unclear risk	Not described
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Low risk	No apparent risk of bias
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	Only abstract, there might be selective reporting
Other bias	Unclear risk	Only abstract, design might cause confounding

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*****Markland 2014****Published and unpublished data*

[Empty]

Excluded studies**Studies awaiting classification****Ongoing studies****Other references****Additional references****Other published versions of this review****Data and analyses****2 PICO 1-5 Markland**


Outcome or Subgroup	Studies	Participants	Statistical Method	Effect Estimate
2.2 Inkontinensstilfælde	1	73	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.70 [-1.55, 2.95]

Figures**Figure 4**



Risk of bias graph: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item presented as percentages across all included studies.

Figure 5



Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.

Sources of support

Internal sources

- No sources of support provided

External sources

- No sources of support provided

Feedback

Appendices