

Why did the authors perform a meta-analysis of studies with primary endpoints they consider clinically unimportant?

Kessler J^{1,2}, Yli BM³, Stray-Pedersen B^{3,4}, Jacobsen AF³, Saugstad OD⁵, Henriksen T³.

1. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Haukeland University Hospital, Bergen
2. Research Group for Pregnancy, Fetal Development and Birth, Department of Clinical Science, University of Bergen, Bergen
3. Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Oslo, University Hospital, Oslo
4. Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Oslo
5. Department of Pediatric Research, Oslo University Hospital, Oslo, Norway

ABSTRACT

The meta-analysis of Blix et al. on ST waveform analysis (STAN) (1) confirmed the results of a previous meta-analysis (2). Their conclusions, however, are based on presuppositions that are highly questionable. The systematic review by Blix et al. (1) was prompted by a recently published American RCT on STAN (3) However, this RCT was performed on a predominantly low-risk population with guidelines for CTG interpretation and threshold for STAN intervention different from those applied in all European RCTs and in clinical use. Furthermore, the experience of the health workers with STAN in this trial must have been minimal beyond the pre-trial courses.