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| **Title** | **Recognition, Treatment, and Monitoring of Canine Hypovolaemic Shock in First Opinion Practice in the United Kingdom** |
| What are the aims or objectives of the study? | The aim of this study was to gain a greater understanding of the detection, treatment, and monitoring of hypovolemic shock (HVS) in dogs, by general practitioners in the United Kingdom. |
| Who carried out the research? | The research was carried out by researchers from the Royal (Dick) School of Veterinary Studies. The lead researcher is a vet and diploma holder with both the American and European Colleges of Veterinary Emergency and Critical Care. |
| Is there a specific research question or hypothesis | There is no explicitly stated research question or hypothesis. However, some of the research questions can be extrapolated from the aims including:1. How do veterinary practitioners in first opinion practice in the UK identify HVS?
2. What fluid type, rate, and volume are routinely used for the first line treatment of HVS?
3. What parameters are monitored during resuscitation to help determine endpoints?

The authors were also interested in trying to gain an understanding of the availability and frequency of use of blood lactate measurement in these patients and if the results could help predict of outcome. |
| Why do you want to review this paper? |  |
| What methods did the researchers use? | An online survey consisting of 23 questions. The survey consisted of multiple choice, dichotomous, and Likert-style questions, including 13 questions that had the option for a free-text response.  |
| Is this methodology appropriate to the objectives or question?Are there any potential sources of bias? | Partially, a questionnaire is a recognised way of gathering information on peoples’ activities and attitudes However, to develop a greater understanding of why people do the things that they report, qualitative data collection such as interviews and focus groups are likely to be needed.The small number of responses make it less likely that the respondents will be representative of the general population and there is a risk that those who complete the questionnaire may be more likely to have a particular interest or strong views on the subject.The researchers should also be aware of the risk of social desirability bias, where respondents provide what they think is the “right” answer. It is not clear whether any of the respondents were working at the same practice. |
| Is the study design described clearly enough to enable you to follow what was done? |  |
| Are the type of patients or participants clearly described? | 177 responses were received from 3312 practices Some information about the participants is given in Table 1. Is there anything else you would like to know about the participants? |
| Are these patients or participants, relevant to your practice, if not what differences need to be considered? |  |
| Is the data collected clearly described? | The results of data collection are presented as a series of charts and tables. |
| Are all patients or participants accounted for in the analysis? | They appear to be. The number and percentage of responses are given in each table. |
| Are the results of the study are clearly described? What could the researchers have done to make the results clearer? | In the methods there is mention of “associations” that were looked for and the analysis of “free text”. Do you think that these analyses are clearly described? |
| What are the findings of the study? | Which parameters are most frequently used to identify HVS?Which type, rate and volume of fluid is most frequently used to treat HVS?Which parameters are used to monitor response to treatment?How frequently is lactate measured?How frequently are vasopressors or positive inotropes used?Are there any other findings of interest? |
| Do you think the results answer the research questions? |  |
| Are the findings likely to be clinically significant? | Although there are no outcome measures in the paper, the variability in approaches and the suggestion that there is a discrepancy in what is being done in practice and optimal care could be clinically significant.  |
| Do the findings support or alter your current knowledge? | This question can be answered both at the practice level and at the professional level. It should be noted that in the discussion the authors make several references to the human literature, suggesting that more research is needed in veterinary practice. |
| Do the findings provide sufficient evidence for you to consider changing your current practice? |  |