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Review question(s)
Which technique has a lower recurrence rate of inguinal hernia; Desarda or Lichtenstein technique?

Searches
The following will be searched:
PubMed/MEDLINE;
The Cochrane Library;
Google Scholar.
Only randomized controlled trials will be included.

Types of study to be included
Randomized controlled trials.

Condition or domain being studied
Primary inguinal hernia.

Participants/ population
Both genders of any age with primary inguinal hernia.

Intervention(s), exposure(s)
Desarda versus Lichtenstein technique.
Non-comparative trials or trials comparing either arms with other types of repair techniques will be excluded.

Comparator(s)/ control
Desarda versus Lichtenstein technique for primary inguinal hernia.

Outcome(s)
Primary outcomes
Recurrence of inguinal hernia.
Secondary outcomes
Complications of surgery.

Data extraction, (selection and coding)
Two researchers will extract the data and any discrepancies will be resolved by discussion.

Risk of bias (quality) assessment
The Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool will be used.

Strategy for data synthesis
Both qualitative and quantitative synthesis of data will be conducted.

Analysis of subgroups or subsets
None intended.
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<th>Started</th>
<th>Completed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary searches</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Piloting of the study selection process</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal screening of search results against eligibility criteria</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data extraction</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of bias (quality) assessment</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data analysis</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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