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1. Discuss the objectives of the study. Did the authors achieve their aims? Although no hypotheses were given, propose plausible hypotheses for this study.

2. Do you agree with the inclusion and exclusion criteria in this study? Which criteria would you change and why?

3. What type of database did the authors use for this investigation? What are the strengths and weaknesses of using this type of database?

4. What were the main conclusions of the study? Do you feel that the conclusions are supported by the data and the analyses? Why or why not?

5. The authors adjusted for each covariate individually. Discuss how this may have affected the analyses and conclusions of this study.

6. Review the American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists’ (ACOG) Practice Bulletin No. 84 (see Obstet Gynecol 2007;110:429–40). How would incorporating the findings from this study differ from the Practice Bulletin?

7. The authors present charts illustrating the changes in route of hysterectomy and myomectomy at their institution over the study period. How are the changes presented similar to or different from changes at your own institution regarding route of hysterectomy and myomectomy? What has influenced changes in your approach to gynecologic surgery, if any, at your institution?

8. What other study design might the authors have employed to determine risk factors for venous thromboembolism? Discuss the limitations and advantages of alternative study designs.

9. The results are presented as relative risks. How do relative risks differ from absolute risk? In this study, are the absolute risks greater or less than the relative risks?