UNIVERSITY *of York*
Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

NHS
National Institute for
Health Research

PROSPERO International prospective register of systematic reviews

Prevalence and predictors of female sexual dysfunction: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Megan McCool, Melissa Theurich, Christian Apfelbacher, Helge Knuettel, Andrea Zuelke

Citation

Megan McCool, Melissa Theurich, Christian Apfelbacher, Helge Knuettel, Andrea Zuelke. Prevalence and predictors of female sexual dysfunction: a systematic review and meta-analysis. PROSPERO 2014:CRD42014009526 Available from http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO_REBRANDING/display_record.asp?ID=CRD42014009526

Review question(s)

To assess the prevalence and significant predictors of sexual dysfunction in general populations of women of reproductive age

Searches

MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO and Web of Science will be searched for relevant publications in the English language.

Link to search strategy

http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPEROFILES/9526_STRATEGY_20140328.pdf

Types of study to be included

Cross-sectional, cohort and case-control studies will be included in the review. Studies must provide the prevalence of at least one domain of FSD.

Condition or domain being studied

The prevalence of female sexual dysfunction will be analyzed in this systematic review and meta-analysis. We will examine the prevalence in the five domains of sexual dysfunction according to the DSM IV: desire disorder, aversion disorder, arousal disorder (incl. lubrication), orgasm disorder, and pain disorder(s).

Participants/ population

The population of interest will include adult women in the general population, from menarche to menopause.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)

The prevalence of female sexual dysfunction will be analyzed in this systematic review and meta-analysis. We will examine the prevalence in the five domains of sexual dysfunction according to the DSM IV: desire disorder, aversion disorder, arousal disorder, orgasm disorder, and pain disorder(s). The population of interest will include adult women in the general population, from menarche to menopause. There will be no geographical limitation on the population studies, however we will only include publications written in the English language.

Comparator(s)/ control

There will be no control group analyzed in this review.

Context

Other characteristics which we will extract from the publications include: date of publication, country, age, number of participants, recruitment methods, measurement tool, validation of tool, characteristics of participants, as well as funding for the study.

Outcome(s)

Primary outcomes

Prevalence of female sexual dysfunction overall and for each of the five domains

Percentages of women with FSD will be listed according to domain. These percentages will then be included in the evidence table as well as in the meta-analysis.

Secondary outcomes
Significant predictors of female sexual dysfunction

Significant predictors of FSD, whether in unadjusted/univariate or adjusted/multivariate models, will be included in the evidence table.

Data extraction, (selection and coding)
Using a pre-designed and pilot-tested electronic data extraction form (Microsoft Access), one review author (MEM) will extract the data from the included studies and a second author (MAT or AZ) will validate the extracted data. Disagreements will be resolved by discussion between the two reviewers; if no agreement can be reached, consensus will be sought through discussions with the third author (CA).

Data will be extracted on:

1) Publication details: title, journal, author(s), year, city and country in which the study was conducted, type of publication, source of funding

2) Design: type of study (cross-sectional, cohort, case-control), aims of study, method of data collection, response rate, recruitment methods, eligibility (inclusion and exclusion criteria), name of assessment tool(s), validation of assessment tool(s)

3) Study participant details: number of persons interviewed or surveyed, population characteristics including age, relationship status, demographic information

4) Data for outcome measures: prevalence of FSD, time period referenced in assessment, significant predictors for each domain

5) Limitations: selection bias, response bias, information bias, limitations of assessment tool(s) used

Risk of bias (quality) assessment
We will use the criteria from Prins et al (2002) for the quality assessment of studies included in the meta-analysis.

Strategy for data synthesis
Extracted data from eligible studies (information about the publications, prevalence rates, and significant predictors) will be presented in evidence tables. A meta-analysis will be performed for each domain of FSD. Limitations of the studies will be discussed in detail. Implications of the review as well as suggestions for future research will also be provided.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets
None planned.

Dissemination plans
Findings will be disseminated through publication in peer-reviewed journals and conference presentations at relevant conferences.

Contact details for further information
Megan McCool

University of Regensburg, Institute for Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine

Dr. Gessler Strasse 17 93051 Regensburg GERMANY

megan.mccool@klinik.uni-regensburg.de

Organisational affiliation of the review

University of Regensburg, Institute for Epidemiology and Preventive Medicine

http://www.epi-regensburg.de/

Review team

Ms Megan McCool, University of Regensburg
Ms Melissa Theurich, Ludwig-Maximilians-University of Munich
Dr Christian Apfelbacher, University of Regensburg
Dr Helge Knuettel, Regensburg University Hospital
Ms Andrea Zuelke, University of Jena

Anticipated or actual start date

02 June 2014

Anticipated completion date

15 October 2014

Funding sources/sponsors

None. The research is part of a PhD project.

Conflicts of interest

None known

Language

English

Country

Germany

Subject index terms status

Subject indexing assigned by CRD

Subject index terms

Female; Humans; Sexual Dysfunctions, Psychological

Reference and/or URL for protocol

The protocol has been reviewed by "Systematic Reviews Journal" and was accepted by the editorial staff on July 1, 2014 and published on July 11, 2014.

http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPEROFILES/9526_PROTOCOL_20140815.pdf

Stage of review

Completed but not published

Date of registration in PROSPERO

29 April 2014

Date of publication of this revision

23 October 2014

DOI

10.15124/CRD42014009526

Stage of review at time of this submission	Started	Completed
Preliminary searches	Yes	Yes
Piloting of the study selection process	Yes	Yes
Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria	Yes	Yes
Data extraction	Yes	Yes
Risk of bias (quality) assessment	Yes	Yes
Data analysis	Yes	Yes