# **Developing a Systematic Review Team**

Systematic Review Training

Center for Knowledge Management



Copyright © VUMC Center for Knowledge Management



# **Objectives:**

✓ Describe factors to consider when developing a systematic review team

#### Systematic Review Key Elements

- A systematic review comprises the *entire process of collecting, reviewing* (e.g., screening by two people, assigning strength of evidence (SOE), risk of bias assessment) and *presenting all available evidence* on a topic
  - Conducted to bring together the best, strongest published literature to aid in decision-making by providing *independent*, *unbiased*, *objective assessment of evidence*
    - Topics are well defined by *Key Questions* devised in collaboration with experts in the field, and entire process is governed by a predefined *Protocol*

Requires *team of topic experts* & local workforce

- Workload spans **1-2 years** depending on topic
  - Protocol is prospectively *registered* in an international database of SRs

Borah R, Brown AW, Capers PL, Kaiser KA. Analysis of the time and workers needed to conduct systematic reviews of medical interventions using data from the PROSPERO registry. BMJ Open. 2017 Feb 27;7(2):e012545. doi: 10.1136/bmjopen-2016-012545. PMID: 28242767; PMCID: PMC5337708.

Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Cochrane, 2023. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

#### Systematic :

- entire process is based on a method or plan (protocol – just like a protocol undertaken in a lab, outlining step by step processes)
- Characterized by order; methodical

*Wordsmyth Adanced Dictionary. 2023.* <u>www.wordsmyth.net/?level=3&ent=system</u> <u>atic</u> 7 March 2023

## Flow diagram for systematic review steps

Research Question & Assemble Team

(Define population, intervention, comparator and outcomes)



### Assembling the team

Recruit and establish a team with the *appropriate expertise* and *experience* to conduct the systematic review

Be sure to include people with expertise in the clinical content, in systematic review methods, in searching, and in *quantitative methods* 

Note: *early in the process*, discuss who will be included as an author on the paper, and what his/her contributions will be.

May need to have dedicated time for up to 2 years

#### **Shared responsibilities**



### Roles to manage and conduct the systematic review

Content experts	local institution, beyond, noted in field; stakeholders who will benefit
Project manager	keeps times, tracks progress, assigns work, is the "glue" for al the team members
Screeners	commit to screen possibly thousands of titles/abstracts and then full-text. To avoid bias, each title/abstract and each article must be evaluated against Key Questions and inclusion/exclusion criteria independently
Adjudicators	breaks ties/creates consensus
Database/Searching expert	with knowledge of broad scope of resources and unique searching syntax of each resource; facility with citation management
Data extractors	high attention to detail; expertise in understanding study outcomes
Statistician	Quantitative analysis

### **Implications of team member selection**

- Number of members should ensure that:
  - 1) review of abstracts and fulltext (i.e., eligibility screening) can be performed by 2 members
  - 2) dual eligibility screening does not overburden specific team members (as there can be thousands of citations initially needing to be screened)
  - 3) a diversity of skills and expertise are represented
- Team composition should reflect:
  - 1) all areas of expertise needed to perform the systematic review
  - 2) content experts holding different points of view
  - 3) "mix of skills, knowledge and objectivity" and "necessary skills and clinical content knowledge" \*\*\*
- Team composition could influence:
  - 1) objectivity of systematic review reported outcomes (due to member bias and/or special interests, i.e, "researcher allegiance"\*\* or pursuing tenure)
  - 2) rigor and comprehensiveness of review

\*Lasserson TJ, Thomas J, Higgins JPT. Chapter 1: Starting a review. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions version 6.4 (updated August 2023). Cochrane, 2023. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

<sup>\*\*</sup> Uttley L, Montgomery P. The influence of the team in conducting a systematic review. Syst Rev. 2017 Aug 1;6(1):149. doi: 10.1186/s13643-017-0548-x. PMID: 28764779; PMCID: PMC5540536.

<sup>\*\*\*</sup>Institute of Medicine (US) Committee on Standards for Systematic Reviews of Comparative Effectiveness Research. Finding What Works in Health Care: Standards for Systematic Reviews. Eden J, Levit L, Berg A, Morton S, editors. Washington (DC): National Academies Press (US); 2011. PMID: 2000-2000



#### Module recap



### Presented by

## **Center for Knowledge Management**

