Cochrane
Library

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Absorbable staples for uterine incision at caesarean section (Review)

Wilkinson CS, Enkin MW

Wilkinson CS, Enkin MW.

Absorbable staples for uterine incision at caesarean section.

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2006, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD000005.

DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD000005.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000005.pub2).

www.cochranelibrary.com

Absorbable staples for uterine incision at caesarean section (Review)

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

WILEY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

HEADER	1
REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION	1
FEEDBACK	1
WHAT'S NEW	1
HISTORY	2
INDEX TERMS	

[Intervention Review]

Absorbable staples for uterine incision at caesarean section

Christopher S Wilkinson¹, Murray W Enkin²

¹Department of Perinatal Medicine, Women's and Children's Hospital, North Adelaide, Australia. ²C/o Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group, Division of Perinatal and Reproductive Medicine, The University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK

Contact address: Sonja Henderson, Cochrane Pregnancy and Childbirth Group, School of Reproductive and Developmental Medicine, Division of Perinatal and Reproductive Medicine, The University of Liverpool, First Floor, Liverpool Women's NHS Foundation Trust, Crown Street, Liverpool, L8 7SS, UK. sonjah@liverpool.ac.uk, s.l.henderson@liverpool.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Publication status and date: Withdrawn from publication for reasons stated in the review, published in Issue 1, 2010.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: Wilkinson CS, Enkin MW. Absorbable staples for uterine incision at caesarean section. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2006, Issue 3. Art. No.: CD000005. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD000005.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD000005.pub2).

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

REASON FOR WITHDRAWAL FROM PUBLICATION

May 2008

The 'Absorbable staples for uterine incision at caesarean section' review has been withdrawn because it has been updated by a new review in the *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2008, Issue 3, entitled 'Surgical techniques for uterine closure at the time of caesarean section'.

The editorial group responsible for this previously published document have withdrawn it from publication.

FEEDBACK

Deeks, June 2001

Summary

Analysis:

For Hoskins 1991, in the analysis of blood loss it is unlikely that the figures quoted are really standard deviations. They would estimate that blood loss in 95% of sutured patients is between 930 and 1030 ml (estimated as mean $\pm$ 2 $\times$ sd (980 $\pm$ (2 $\times$ 24.3))), far too narrow a range to be true. Also, the result of a significance test assuming the values to be standard deviations would be statistically significant, when it is not reported as such in the original paper. The values are more likely to be standard errors, multiplying by the square root of the sample size gives values that are more similar to those from other trials (although still the smallest).

This should be clarified, as it will affect the results for this comparison.

[Summary of comment from Jon Deeks, June 2001]

Reply

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

Contributors

Jon Deeks

WHAT'S NEW

Date	Event	Description
14 April 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 1, 1995

Review first published: Issue 1, 1995

Date	Event	Description
20 August 2001	Feedback has been incorporated	Feedback added
25 December 1994	New citation required and conclusions have changed	Substantive amendment