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Background: Aim

To develop a simple table to summarise where the included references in a systematic review came from
Background: Why?

• How good was my search
• Doing ‘just in case’ searching
• Being asked to search more databases
• Witnessing PhD students/other researchers searching more and more databases
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project title</th>
<th>Database searches (date run)</th>
<th>Supplementary searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>d/b 1</td>
<td>d/b 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included ref 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included ref 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included ref 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included ref 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Included ref 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | No. of included refs |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | No. unique refs |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Total no. refs downloaded |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | No. refs screened |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | No. database searches carried out = |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Total no. refs found from searching = |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | No. refs screened at Ti&Ab = |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | No. of included refs from searching = |
|                  |       |       |       |       |       |       |       | Total no. of included refs = |
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Search Summary Table - Codes

x = found from the search
fcs=forwards citation search
bcs=backwards citation search
hs=hand search
ws = web search
org = from organisations
Search Summary Table

Results

Table 1

Table 2

Included References
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### Included references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>References</th>
<th>Database searches (Jan 2014)</th>
<th>Suppl searches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>amed</td>
<td>cinah</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bae 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekow 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menter 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packham 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyring 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Heijde 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| No. included refs | 0 | 2 | 4 | 4 | 5 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| No. unique refs   | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Total no. refs downloaded | 4 | 111 | 100 | 542 | 546 | 30 |
| No. refs screened | 0 | 74 | 44 | 288 | 532 | 25 |

No. database searches carried out = 6

Total no. refs found from searching = 1351

No. refs screened at Ti&Ab = 963

No. of included refs from searching = 5

Total no. of included refs = 7

© If you would like to use these slides, please contact ISTeam@exeter.ac.uk
Results

*Table 1*
- bcs and hs did not provide any additional references to include
- AMED and PsycINFO retrieved no included references
- No database provided a unique reference
- Searching just Medline and doing fcs provided all included references. Total number of references to screen would be 564 maximum

*Table 2*

Included References
### Tumour necrosis factor-α inhibitor therapy in chronic physical illness: A systematic review

#### Included references

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reference</th>
<th>amed</th>
<th>cinah</th>
<th>(cochr)</th>
<th>(emb)</th>
<th>(medl)</th>
<th>psycin</th>
<th>fcs</th>
<th>bcs</th>
<th>hs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bae 2013</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kekow 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Machado 2014</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>y</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menter 2010</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Packham 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tyring 2006</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van der Heijde 2012</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>y</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>z</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. included refs</th>
<th>No. unique refs</th>
<th>Total no. refs downloaded</th>
<th>No. refs screened</th>
<th>No. database searches carried out</th>
<th>Total no. refs found from searching</th>
<th>No. refs screened at Ti&amp;Ab</th>
<th>No. of included refs from searching</th>
<th>No. of included refs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1351</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

© If you would like to use these slides, please contact iSTeam@exeter.ac.uk
Search Summary Table - Codes

X=found from the systematic review searching
y-in the database and found from the search strategy when re-run
n-not in the database
z-in the database but not found using the search strategy
(red) – the databases where the search was re-run
Search Summary Table

Results

Table 1
Table 2

• Both fcs references would have been caught in a later search in Cochrane
• Later search strategy on Cochrane would have retrieved all the included results with a maximum of 100 refs to screen
• Van der Heijde 2012 was picked up from the search in Cochrane but not Medline

Included References
Positives/Negatives

• Might be time consuming
• More tricky to do retrospectively
• May make our work more open to criticism

• Makes our work more transparent
• Provides data to carry out research
• Helps us with our search strategies
• Makes us more accountable
Uses

- Evidence for Information Specialists:
  - Which databases to use
  - Which databases to have access to
  - Research
  - Audit/measurement/purchasing
- Evidence for searching:
  - Update searches
  - Scoping searches
- Evidence to inform systematic reviews:
  - Future SRs on similar topics
  - Rapid reviews
  - Scoping reviews
  - Updates of systematic reviews
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Research Questions

• How useful are the supplementary searching methods
• Are there bias issues
• How good are our searches
• Development and modification of search filters
  • Eg systematic review filter
• Useful to gather search summaries on similar:
  • Populations
  • Interventions
  • Study types
Next steps

- Use the results to carry out the update searches in a live review (Apr)
- Put our summaries onto our website
- Create new summaries of our other PenCLAHRC systematic reviews
- Ask people to use it and complete a questionnaire to find out if it is useful
- Encourage others to complete them
- Try getting one published as an appendix to an SR
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Thank you – questions?

a.bethel@exeter.ac.uk
@AlisonBethel
@EvidSynthTeam