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| **Title** | **A prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled, double-blinded clinical trial comparing the incidence and severity of gastrointestinal adverse events in dogs with cancer treated with piroxicam alone or in combination with omeprazole or famotidine**  *Journal of the American Veterinary Medical Association*, 259 (4), pp385-391. |
| **What are the aims or objectives of the study?**  A clearly stated aim or objective will make it easier for you to assess whether the research has been appropriately designed to meet these aims. |  |
| **Who carried out the research?**  Do the researchers have appropriate knowledge or supervision to carry out the research?  **Who is paying for the study?**  Do you think that this could bias the results? |  |
| **Are there any potential sources of bias?**  **What steps were taken to reduce this bias?** |  |
| **Is there a specific research question or hypothesis?** |  |
| **Why do you want to review this paper?** |  |
| **What methods did the researchers use?**  **Can you pick out the elements of a PICO question from the materials and methods section?**   * Patients/participants * Intervention * Comparator * Outcome |  |
| **Is this methodology appropriate to the objectives or question?**  More detailed guidance on how to critically appraise different types of study can be found in the [EBVM Toolkit Section 3](https://knowledge.rcvs.org.uk/evidence-based-veterinary-medicine/ebvm-toolkit/) |  |
| **Is the methodology described clearly enough to enable you to follow what was done?**  **Is there any additional information you would like to know?** |  |
| **Are the type and selection of patients clearly described?**  Are the inclusion and exclusion criteria clearly described?  What effect do you think that these criteria would have on recruitment? |  |
| **How many patients were included in the study?**  The sample size calculation gave a recruitment target of 72 dogs (24 per group). Was this target met?  What reason was given for stopping recruitment to the study early? |  |
| **Are the patients divided into groups, if so, how was this done?**  Is the method of randomisation and blinding clearly described? |  |
| **How were each of the three groups treated?** |  |
| **Is the data collected clearly described?**  What data was collected from each dog? |  |
| **Are the results of the study clearly described?**  **How were adverse events described and reported?**  **Which adverse events would you consider most important?** |  |
| **Which results are statistically significant?**  **Which results were not statistically significant, and why might this be the case?** |  |
| **What other result did the authors report and why might it be significant?** |  |
| **What is the main recommendation from the study, and do you agree with it?**  **What mechanism do the authors propose for this recommendation?**  **Do you think that the same recommendation would apply to other situations?** |  |
| **What are the limitations of the study?** |  |
| **Do the findings provide sufficient evidence for you to consider changing your current practice?** |  |
| **Having read the paper are there any other sources of information you need to look at before changing your current practice?** | Some references that may be of interest are given below |
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