



Literature reviews

Welcome to the family

Thomas pelgrim MSc

Medisch informatiespecialist



Review-paniek!

Hoeveel soorten reviews zijn er?

Sutton, A., Clowes, M., Preston, L., & Booth, A. (2019). Meeting the review family: exploring review types and associated information retrieval requirements. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 36(3), 202-222.

Inclusion criteria types of reviews:

1. is included in at least one health reviews typology OR

2. has at least one methodological paper/worked example OR

3. has at least ten examples indexed on PUBMED (excluding protocols)

Inclusion criteria available guidance :

1. official guidance – produced by a recognized organisation which either generates or commissions reviews.

2. methodological advice – peer reviewed publications by authors with experience of conducting reviews.

3. current practice – case studies, conference presentations or online resources (where these contain a description of search methods).



48 soorten reviews gevonden





7 families identified

- Traditional reviews
- Systematic Reviews
- Review of reviews
- Rapid Reviews
- Qualitative reviews
- Mixed Method reviews
- Purpose specific Reviews

Wat is een...



Narrative review



Systematic review



Umbrella review



Rapid review



Scoping review



Traditional review family

- Critical review
- Integrative Review
- *Integrative Synthesis*
- Narrative review
- Narrative summary
- State of the art review

✓ Narrative review

Literature reviews are usually written for one of three potential purposes—

- as an introduction to a primary research article
- as evidence justifying the case made in a proposal
- as a general overview of a topic.

(Foster, 2017)

Kenmerken narrative reviews

- Broad overview of a topic related research area
- Not predefined protocol-based
- Inclusion based on Authors' intuition and research experience
- Limited databases searched
- Data extraction not protocol based
- Overall description of each study, mainly focusing in studies that authors selected
- Partially objective grading by anecdotal resources

(Pae, 2015)

Beperkingen narrative review

- Not reproducible
 - Limited sources searched
 - Significant bias issues
 - may not evaluate quality of evidence
- (Foster, 2017)



Systematic review family

- Cochrane review of effects
- Comparative effectiveness review
- Diagnostic Systematic Review
- *Diagnostic Test Accuracy Review*
- Meta-analysis
- Network meta-analysis
- Prognostic review
- Psychometric review
- Review of economic evaluations
- Systematic review
- Prevalence and/or Incidence Review
- Etiology and/or Risk Review



Systematic review

A systematic review uses systematic and explicit methods to identify, select, critically appraise, and extract and analyze data from relevant research (Higgins & Green 2011)

1. Uncover the international evidence
2. Confirm current practice/ address any variation/ identify new practices
3. Identify and inform areas for future research
4. Identify and investigate conflicting results
5. Produce statements to guide decision-making

(Munn, 2019)

Kenmerken systematic review 1

- Protocol registered with PROSPERO and published in Sys Rev journal
- Comprehensive and systematic literature search (6 databases)
- Pre-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria (i.e., study eligibility criteria)
- Risk of bias appraisal (Cochrane for trials, McHarm for reporting harms)

(Trico et al., 2015)

Kenmerken systematic review 2

- Pre-defined data abstraction form
- Synthesis based on the totality of evidence
- Discussion, providing limitations of included studies and review process
- Each step conducted by 2 reviewers, independently

(Trico et al., 2015)

Beperkingen Systematic Review

- Systematic reviews take an average 1,139 hours (range 216 to 2,518 hours) to complete
- Usually require a budget of at least \$100,000[Petticrew, 2006]
- Very resource-intensive
(Trico et al., 2015)



Review of review family

- Review of Reviews
- Overview
- Umbrella review



Umbrella review

‘Specifically refers to review compiling evidence from multiple reviews into one accessible and usable document.’

(Grant & Booth, 2009)

Kenmerken umbrella reviews

- Each umbrella review focuses on a broad condition or problem for which there are two or more potential interventions and highlights reviews that address these potential interventions and their results.
- Identification of component reviews, but no search for primary studies.
- Umbrella reviews were initially conceived as a 'friendly front end' to The Cochrane Library, allowing the reader a quick overview (and an exhaustive list) of reviews relevant to the decision at hand
- Quality assessment of studies within component reviews and/or of reviews themselves.

(Grant & Booth, 2009)

Beperkingen umbrella review

- For an umbrella review to be truly useful requires the pre-existence of the narrower component reviews.

(Grant & Booth, 2009)

- Umbrella reviews can only report what researchers have investigated, published and systematically reviewed or meta-analysed.
- Newest research not included unless existing reviews are updated.

(Fusar-Poli & Radua, 2018)



Rapid review family

- Rapid Review
- *Rapid Evidence Synthesis*
- Rapid evidence assessment
- Rapid Realist Synthesis
- *Rapid Realist Review*

Rapid review

'a type of knowledge synthesis in which components of the systematic review process are simplified or omitted to produce information in a short period of time'

(Tricco et al., 2015)

Kenmerken rapid reviews 1

- Protocol registered with PROSPERO and ~~published in Sys Rev journal~~
 - Comprehensive and systematic literature search (6 3 databases)
 - Pre-defined inclusion and exclusion criteria (i.e., study eligibility criteria)
 - Risk of bias appraisal (Cochrane for trials, ~~McHarmfor reporting harms~~)
- (Tricco et al., 2015)

Kenmerken rapid reviews 2

- Pre-defined data abstraction form
- ~~Synthesis based on the totality of evidence~~
- Discussion, providing limitations of included studies and review process
- Each step conducted by ~~2~~ 1 reviewers, ~~independently~~

Example: 4 months to conduct and submit report, 183 randomized trials included

(Tricco et al., 2015)

Beperkingen rapid reviews

- Might be susceptible to bias as a consequence of streamlining the systematic review process
 - Sampling bias, choosing studies bias, obtaining accurate data bias [Tricco, 2008]
- We currently don't know the extent of this bias

(Trico et al., 2015)



Qualitative Review family/Experiential Reviews 1

- Qualitative Evidence Synthesis (QES)
- Qualitative Interpretive Meta-synthesis
- Qualitative meta-synthesis
- Qualitative research synthesis
- Best fit framework synthesis
- Framework synthesis
- Meta-aggregation
- Meta-Ethnography
- *Extended Meta-Ethnography*



Qualitative Review family/Experiential Reviews 2

- *Meta-Ethnography Review*
- Meta-interpretation
- Meta-narrative review
- Meta-Study
- *Meta-Theory*
- Meta-Summary
- Thematic Synthesis
- *Thematic Analysis*



Mixed methods review family

- Mixed Methods Synthesis
- Mixed Methods Review
- Bayesian Meta-Analysis
- *Bayesian Approach*
- EPPI-Centre Review
- *EPPI-Centre Outcomes plus Views Review*
- Critical interpretive synthesis
- Narrative Synthesis
- *Textual Narrative Synthesis*
- Realist Synthesis
- *Realist Review*
- Rapid Realist Synthesis



Purpose Specific Reviews 1

- Concept Synthesis
- *Concept Analysis*
- *Conceptual Analysis*
- Content Analysis
- Expert Opinion
- Policy Review
- Technology Assessment Review
- Health Technology Assessment



Purpose Specific Reviews 2

- Scoping Review
- *Scoping Study*
- Mapping Review
- [Evidence Map](#)
- *Systematic Map*
- *Systematic Mapping Review*
- Methodological Review
- *Meta-Method*
- *Methodology Review*
- Systematic Search and Review
- Systematized Review

Scoping review?

- To identify the types of available evidence in a given field
 - To clarify key concepts/ definitions in the literature
 - To examine how research is conducted on a certain topic or field
 - To identify key characteristics or factors related to a concept
 - As a precursor to a systematic review
 - To identify and analyse knowledge gaps
- (Munn, 2018)

Kenmerken scoping reviews 1

- Provides overview of state of evidence in a field
 - Includes published and un-published literature
 - Includes wide range of study-designs and methodologies
 - Tool for mapping broad and diverse topics
- (O'Brien et al., 2016)

Kenmerken scoping reviews 2

- Systematic process (replicable, transparent, rigorous)
 - Synthesizes evidence on an emerging topic
 - Focus on state of research activity (rather than quality of literature)
- (O'Brien et al., 2016)

Beperkingen scoping reviews

- Difficult establishing boundaries with broad scope
- Lack of detailed methodological steps, guidance standards
- Unclear how to interpret scoping evidence with lack of quality appraisal
- Variability in scoping terminology and definitions
- Feasibility – potential requirements for increased time and resources (with iterative process; stakeholder consultation)
- (O'Brien et al., 2016)

Toekomst





Vragen?

Bronnen

- Arksey, H., & O'Malley, L. (2005). Scoping studies: Towards a methodological framework. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, 8(1), 19–32. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1364557032000119616>
- Chapter 11: Scoping reviews—JBI Reviewer's Manual—JBI GLOBAL WIKI. (z.d.). Geraadpleegd 9 december 2019, van <https://wiki.joannabriggs.org/display/MANUAL/Chapter+11%3A+Scoping+reviews>
- Colquhoun, H. L., Levac, D., O'Brien, K. K., Straus, S., Tricco, A. C., Perrier, L., ... Moher, D. (2014). Scoping reviews: Time for clarity in definition, methods, and reporting. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, 67(12), 1291–1294. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2014.03.013>
- Foster, M. J., & Jewell, S. T. (2017). *Assembling the Pieces of a Systematic Review: A Guide for Librarians*. Geraadpleegd van <http://stcproxy.han.nl/han/hanquest/search.easchost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=mcbk&AN=1456457&lang=en&site=eds-live&scope=site>
- Fusar-Poli, P., & Radua, J. (2018). Ten simple rules for conducting umbrella reviews. *Evidence-Based Mental Health*, 21(3), 95–100. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ebmental-2018-300014>
- Grant, M. J., & Booth, A. (2009). A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 26(2), 91–108. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x>
- Levac, D., Colquhoun, H., & O'Brien, K. K. (2010). Scoping studies: Advancing the methodology. *Implementation Science: IS*, 5, 69. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-69>
- Moher, D., Stewart, L., & Shekelle, P. (2015). All in the Family: Systematic reviews, rapid reviews, scoping reviews, realist reviews, and more. *Systematic Reviews*, 4(1), 183. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s13643-015-0163-7>
- Munn, Z., Peters, M. D. J., Stern, C., Tufanaru, C., McArthur, A., & Aromataris, E. (2018). Systematic review or scoping review? Guidance for authors when choosing between a systematic or scoping review approach. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 18(1), 143. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12874-018-0611-x>
- Pae, C.-U. (2015). Why Systematic Review rather than Narrative Review? *Psychiatry Investigation*, 12(3), 417–419. <https://doi.org/10.4306/pi.2015.12.3.417>
- Peters, M. D. J., Godfrey, C. M., Khalil, H., McInerney, P., Parker, D., & Soares, C. B. (2015). Guidance for conducting systematic scoping reviews. *International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare*, 13(3), 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1097/XEB.0000000000000050>
- Peterson, J., Pearce, P. F., Ferguson, L. A., & Langford, C. A. (2017). Understanding scoping reviews: Definition, purpose, and process. *Journal of the American Association of Nurse Practitioners*, 29(1), 12–16. <https://doi.org/10.1002/2327-8924.12380>
- Sutton, A., Clowes, M., Preston, L., & Booth, A. (2019). Meeting the review family: Exploring review types and associated information retrieval requirements. *Health Information & Libraries Journal*, 36(3), 202–222. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hir.12276>
- Temple University(z.d.). *Systematic Reviews & Other Review Types*. Geraadpleegd 12 december 2019, van WHO website: <https://guides.temple.edu/c.php?g=78618&p=3879604>
- Tricco, A. C., Antony, J., & Straus, S. E. (z.d.). *Systematic reviews vs. Rapid reviews: What's the difference?* 69.
- Tricco, A. C., Langlois, E. V., & Straus, S. E. (2017). *Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide*.
- Tricco, A. C., Lillie, E., Zarin, W., O'Brien, K. K., Colquhoun, H., Levac, D., ... Straus, S. E. (2018). PRISMA Extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR): Checklist and Explanation. *Annals of Internal Medicine*, 169(7), 467. <https://doi.org/10.7326/M18-0850>
- WHO | Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: A practical guide. (z.d.). Geraadpleegd 12 december 2019, van WHO website: <http://www.who.int/alliance-hpsr/resources/publications/rapid-review-guide/en/>