

ADDITIONAL RESOURCES AND TRANSCRIPT

Gathering Research: Why All Librarians Should Care About Systematic Reviews

Transcript Available via:

<https://drive.google.com/file/d/1twizpUDfksXXYklq6cbfytJrC1bCSN-C/view?usp=sharing>

OLA Superconference February 2022

Mê-Linh Lê, Janice Hermer, Christine Neilson, Zahra Premji, and Janice Winkler

LINK TO THIS PAGE: <https://bit.ly/OLA-SystematicReviews>

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[GET STARTED HERE](#)

[ARTICLES](#)

[BOOKS AND BOOK CHAPTERS](#)

[JOURNALS](#)

[TRAINING AND WEBINARS](#)

[WEBSITES AND TOOLS](#)

[INTEREST GROUPS](#)

GET STARTED HERE

1. Sutton A, Clowes M, Preston L. and Booth A. Meeting the review family: exploring review types and associated information retrieval requirements. Health Information and Libraries Journal. 2019. 36: 202-222.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/hir.12276>
 - o *Description and classifications of wide variety of review types*
2. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) & Associated Extensions <http://prisma-statement.org/>

- a) PRISMA
 - b) PRISMA-[Protocol](#)
 - c) PRISMA-[Searching](#)
 - d) PRISMA-[Scoping Review](#)
 - Evidence-based minimum set of items for reporting in systematic reviews and meta-analyses. Various extensions over the year provide additional information on guidance for different parts or types of a review
3. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Littlewood A, Marshall C, Metzendorf M-I, Noel-Storr A, Rader T, Shokraneh F, Thomas J, Wieland LS. Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.2 (updated February 2021). Cochrane, 2021. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.
 - Definitive and exhaustive guide to searching for systematic reviews
 4. Foster MJ, Jewell ST. 2017. *Assembling the pieces of a systematic review : A guide for librarians*. Rowman & Littlefield.
 - Complete guide on developing and delivering a complete SR service; broad application to all disciplines
 5. Kocher M & Riegelman A. Systematic reviews and evidence synthesis: Resources beyond the health sciences. *College & Research Libraries News*. 2018. 79(5):248.
 - Guidelines, protocols, tools, etc for SRs outside of health

ARTICLES

Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH. Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: A prospective exploratory study. *Systematic Reviews*. 2017. 6(1):245. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-017-0644-y>

- While the example is health sciences related, this article exemplifies the purpose of using multiple databases and the difficulties of ensuring a SR finds and filters the majority of literature available on a topic

Borrego M, Foster MJ, & Froyd JE. Systematic literature reviews in engineering education and other developing interdisciplinary fields. *Journal of Engineering Education*. 2014. 103(1): 45-76.

- Methods are adapted to engineering education and similar developing interdisciplinary fields. Fourteen exemplars are presented in this article and used to illustrate systematic review procedures.

Cooper C, Dawson S, Peters J, et al. Revisiting the need for a literature search narrative: A brief methodological note. *Research Synthesis Methods*. 2018. 9:361–365.

- *A brief paper arguing for the inclusion of a search narrative - which explains WHY articles were found, instead of just HOW - in a published search strategy.*

de Almeida Biolchini JC et al. Scientific research ontology to support systematic review in software engineering. *Advanced Engineering Informatics*. 2007. 21(2):133-151.

- *Discusses importance of SRS in software engineering and includes a template to complete them*

Haddaway NR et al. ROSES RepOrting standards for Systematic Evidence Syntheses: pro forma, flow-diagram and descriptive summary of the plan and conduct of environmental systematic reviews and systematic maps. *Environmental Evidence*. 2018. 7: 7. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13750-018-0121-7>

- *An equivalent to PRISMA; forms, tools, and reporting standards for SRs in conservation and environmental management*

Foo YZ et al. A practical guide to question formation, systematic searching and study screening for literature reviews in ecology and evolution. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution*. 2021. 12: 1705– 1720. <https://doi.org/10.1111/2041-210X.13654>

- *A guide for ecologists and evolutionary biologists on how to formulate a SR question*

Greenhalgh T, Thorne, S & Malterud K. Time to challenge the spurious hierarchy of systematic over narrative reviews?. *European Journal of Clinical Investigation*. 2018. 48: e12931. doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111%2fec.12931>

- *Position paper arguing for the continuing importance of narrative reviews*

Kallaher A et al. Library systematic review service supports evidence-based practice outside of medicine. *The Journal of Academic Librarianship*. 2020. 46(6). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102222>

- *SR's in other fields are being supported by health sciences librarians for lack of experience by other subject liaisons*

Kitchenham B, Brereton P. A systematic review of systematic review process research in software engineering. *Information and Software Technology*. 2013. 55(12):2049-2075.

- *One of the best established and core guidelines for non-health SR*

Kocher M & Riegelman A. Systematic reviews and evidence synthesis: Resources beyond the health sciences. *College & Research Libraries News*. 2018. 79(5):248.

- *Guidelines, protocols, tools, etc for SRs outside of health*

Koffel JB. Use of recommended search strategies in systematic reviews and the impact of librarian involvement: A cross-sectional survey of recent authors. PLoS One. 2015. 10(5):e0125931. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0125931>

- *Evidence that librarian involvement in the SR process results in better, more consistent SR*

McGowan J et al. PRESS peer review of electronic search strategies: 2015 guideline statement. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2016. 75:40-46.

<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2016.01.021>.

- *Standard template for conducting peer reviews of SR search strategies*

Peters MDJ et al. Scoping reviews: reinforcing and advancing the methodology and application. Systematic Reviews. 2021. 10: article number 263.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-021-01821-3>

- *Highlights differences between scoping reviews and other review types, reasons for doing scoping reviews, and guidance for conducting and reporting*

Rethlefsen ML et al. Librarian co-authors correlated with higher quality reported search strategies in general internal medicine systematic reviews. Journal of Clinical Epidemiology. 2015. 68(6):617-626. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.11.025>

- *More research indicating librarian involvement improves quality of SR*

Rethlefsen ML. PRISMA-S: an extension to the PRISMA Statement for Reporting Literature Searches in Systematic Reviews. Systematic Reviews. 2021. 10: article number 39.

<https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-020-01542-z>

- *Additional detail on lit search reporting for SRs*

Schellinger J et al. The effect of librarian involvement on the quality of systematic reviews in dental medicine. PloS one. 2021. 16(9): e0256833.

- *Article showing value of librarian involvement in SRs*

Sutton A, Clowes M, Preston L. and Booth A. Meeting the review family: exploring review types and associated information retrieval requirements. Health Information and Libraries Journal. 2019. 36: 202-222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hir.12276>

- *Description and classifications of wide variety of review types*

Tranfield D, Denyer D, & Smart P. Towards a methodology for developing evidence-informed management knowledge by means of systematic review. British Journal of Management. 2003. 14(3):207-222.

- *Another well respected and established guideline for non-health SR (management)*

Wong G et al. RAMESES II reporting standards for realist evaluations. BMC Medicine. 2016. 14: article number 96. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-016-0643-1>

- *Standards for realist evaluations ('what works, for whom, under what circumstances, and how')*

Gusenbauer, M., & Haddaway, N. R. (2020). Which academic search systems are suitable for systematic reviews or meta-analyses? Evaluating retrieval qualities of Google Scholar, PubMed, and 26 other resources. *Research synthesis methods*, 11(2), 181-217.

- *This article discusses the functionality of different platforms and their suitability for comprehensive searching. It is often used as evidence for why Google Scholar is not a suitable option as a primary database for knowledge synthesis reviews*

BOOKS AND BOOK CHAPTERS

Denyer D and Tranfield D. 2009. Producing a systematic review. The SAGE handbook of organizational research methods. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd. p. 671-689. Available via: <https://www.cebma.org/wp-content/uploads/Denyer-Tranfield-Producing-a-Systematic-Review.pdf>

- *Guidance on using reviews of research evidence in managements and organization studies*

Foster MJ, Jewell ST. 2017. Assembling the pieces of a systematic review : A guide for librarians. Rowman & Littlefield.

- *Complete guide on developing and delivering a complete SR service; broad application to all disciplines*

Gough D, Oliver S, Thomas J.. An Introduction to Systematic Reviews. 2nd Ed.. Los Angeles: SAGE, 2017.

- *Targeted at entire SR research team; broad application to all disciplines*

Heyvaert M et al. 2016. Using Mixed Methods Research Synthesis for Literature Reviews. Sage Publications.

- *Step by step guidance for completing mixed methods (qualitative and quantitative data) knowledge synthesis research*

Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Briscoe S, Littlewood A, Marshall C, Metzendorf M-I, Noel-Storr A, Rader T, Shokraneh F, Thomas J, Wieland LS. Chapter 4: Searching for and selecting studies. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.2 (updated February 2021). Cochrane, 2021. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

- *Definitive and exhaustive guide to searching for systematic reviews*

Pawson, Ray. 2006. *Evidence-Based Policy a Realist Perspective* . SAGE.

- *An examination of some of the weaknesses of systematic reviews; argues for more realist syntheses. Applicable to researchers and librarians in all disciplines*

Petticrew M, Roberts H. 2008. *Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences: a Practical Guide*. Wiley.

- *A key title for researchers considering SRs in the social sciences; details the entire process*

Pigott TD. 2009. *Research Synthesis and Education Policy*. In G. Sykes, B. Schneider, & D.N. Plank. (eds). *Handbook of Education Policy Research* (pp. 154-162). Routledge.

- *Outlines the role that SRs can play in the development of educational policy*

Saini M, Shlonsky A. 2012. *Systematic Synthesis of Qualitative Research*. Oxford University Press.

- *Discussion and 11-step approach on SRs using qualitative research*

JOURNALS

Systematic Reviews (<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/>)

- *The journal publishes high quality systematic review products including systematic review protocols, systematic reviews related to a very broad definition of health, rapid reviews, updates of already completed systematic reviews, and methods research related to the science of systematic reviews, such as decision modelling*

Research Synthesis Methods (<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/journal/17592887>)

- *This journal is dedicated to synthesis methods and is not discipline-specific.*

TRAINING AND WEBINARS

Evidence Synthesis Institute (<https://www.lib.umn.edu/about/evidence-synthesis-institute>)

- *Institute of Museum and Library Services (IMLS) funded cross-institutional training program for librarians doing knowledge syntheses in all disciplines (Note: Canadian spots are limited due to funding requirements)*

Riegelman A, Kocher M. Librarians and Evidence Synthesis Outside the Health Sciences. CHLA KNowledge Synthesis Interest Group webinar. 2021.

<https://sites.google.com/view/esoutsidehealthsciences/home>

- *1-hour webinar by two founders of the Evidence Institute on their initiative*

Rethlefsen R, Ayala P. PRISMA-S. CHLA Knowledge Synthesis Interest Group webinar. 2021. https://drive.google.com/file/d/1BlvyLbg3DaxDTd_USFuX75kPls8Sb3sx/view

- *Webinar on the extension to PRISMA focused on the search strategy*

Sampson M. Peer reviewing search strategies using PRESS: An introduction. CHLA KNowledge Synthesis Interest Group webinar. 2019. <https://sites.google.com/view/ksig-webinar-intro-to-press/home>

- *Webinar introducing and outlining steps for doing a peer-review of a search strategy*

Tricco A. How to conduct and report your scoping review: latest guidance. Joanna Briggs Institute webinar. 2020. <https://youtu.be/5Db5JILJDRQ>

- *Webinar on conducting and reporting scoping reviews*

WEBSITES AND TOOLS

Systematic Review Toolbox <http://systematicreviewtools.com/>

- *Web-based catalogue of tools that support various tasks within the systematic review and wider evidence synthesis process*

Campbell Collaboration Resources

- *The Campbell Collaboration is an international social science research network that produces high quality, open and policy-relevant evidence syntheses, plain language summaries and policy briefs.*

Methodological Expectations of Campbell Collaboration Intervention Reviews (MECCIR)

1. Conduct Standards <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/pb-assets/Campbell%20MECCIR%20Conduct%20standards%20Nov2019-1573120397657.docx>

2. Reporting Standards <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/pb-assets/Campbell%20MECCIR%20Reporting%20standards%20Nov2019-1573120411587.docx>
3. Campbell conduct and reporting standards checklists for evidence and gap maps
4. Guidance for producing a Campbell evidence and gap map <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/cl2.1125>

Collaboration for Environmental Evidence Resources. 2018. Guidelines and Standards for Evidence synthesis in Environmental Management. Version 5.0 (AS Pullin, GK Frampton, B Livoreil & G Petrokofsky, Eds)

www.environmentalevidence.org/information-for-authors

- *Clear guidance and standards for evidence syntheses in environmental sciences*

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) & Associated Extensions <http://prisma-statement.org/>

- *Evidence-based minimum set of items for reporting in systematic reviews and meta-analyses.*

INTEREST GROUPS

Knowledge Synthesis Interest group (KSIG) - Canadian Health Libraries Association (CHLA)

- *Events are typically open to individuals regardless of whether they are CHLA members (notifications via listserv. Listserv sign-up: https://listes.koumbit.net/cgi-bin/mailman/listinfo/ks-list-chlaabsc.koumbit.org_)*

Evidence Synthesis Methods Interest Group (ACRL)

- *Interest group to help promote competencies around SRs in all disciplines. (Note: You do not need to be an ALA member to join the ALA Connect listserv)*