

IRG eNewsletter

July 2018
Number 14



Publications of Interest

Ara R, Brazier J, Peasgood T, Paisley S. The identification, review and synthesis of health state utility values from the literature. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2017 Dec;35(Suppl 1):43-55.

<https://link.springer.com/article/10.1007%2Fs40273-017-0547-8>

Arber M, Garcia S, Veale T, Edwards M, Shaw A, Glanville JM. Performance of Ovid Medline search filters to identify health state utility studies. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 2017 Jan;33(4):472-80.

Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29065942>

Arber M, Wood H, Isojarvi J, Glanville J. Which information sources should be used to identify studies for systematic reviews of economic evaluations in healthcare? *Value Health*. 2017 Oct/Nov;20(9):A738. Abstract PRM46.

[http://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098-3015\(17\)32366-5/pdf](http://www.valueinhealthjournal.com/article/S1098-3015(17)32366-5/pdf)

Bakker C, Riegelman A. Retracted publications in mental health literature: discovery across bibliographic platforms. *Journal of Librarianship and Scholarly Communication*. 2018;6(1):eP2199.

<https://jls-cpub.org/articles/10.7710/2162-3309.2199/galley/160/download/>

Bashir R, Bourgeois FT, Dunn AG. A systematic review of the processes used to link clinical trial registrations to their published results. *Syst Rev*. 2017 Jul 3;6(1):123.

<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-017-0518-3>

Blagosklonny MV. Librarians against scientists: Oncotarget lesson. *Oncotarget*. 2018;9(5):5515-6.

<https://doi.org/10.18632/oncotarget.24272>

Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Mast F, Kleijnen J. Evaluation of a new method for librarian-mediated literature searches for systematic reviews. *Res Synth Methods*. 2017 Oct 26. [Epub ahead of print]

<http://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1002/jrsm.1279/epdf>

Bramer WM, Rethlefsen ML, Kleijnen J, Franco OH. Optimal database combinations for literature searches in systematic reviews: a prospective exploratory study. *Syst Rev*. 2017 Dec 6;6(1):245.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5718002/>

Budhram D, Navarro-Ruan T, Haynes RB. The efficiency of database searches for creating systematic reviews was improved by search filters. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2018 Mar;95:1-6.

Abstract: [http://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356\(17\)30209-3/abstract](http://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356(17)30209-3/abstract)

Bullers K, Howard AM, Hanson A, Kearns WD, Orriola JJ, Polo RL, Sakmar KA. It takes longer than you think: librarian time spent on systematic review tasks. *J Med Libr Assoc*. 2018 Apr;106(2):198-207.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5886502/>

Bullion JW, Brower SM. Enhancing the research and publication efforts of health sciences librarians via an academic writing retreat. *J Med Libr Assoc*. 2017 Oct;105(4):394-9.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5624429/>

Burki, T. Cochrane postpones comprehensive free access to reviews. *The Lancet* 2018 May 12;391(10133):1885.
No abstract available.

Cooper C, Booth A, Britten N, Garside R. A comparison of results of empirical studies of supplementary search techniques and recommendations in review methodology handbooks: a methodological review. *Syst Rev*. 2017 Nov 28;6(1):234.
<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-017-0625-1>

Cooper C, Varley-Campbell J, Booth A, Britten N, Garside R. Systematic review identifies six metrics and one method for assessing literature search effectiveness but no consensus on appropriate use. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2018 Jul;99:53-63.
Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29526555>

Crockett LK, Okoli GN, Neilson CJ, Rabbani R, Abou-Setta AM, Klassen TP. Publication of randomized clinical trials in pediatric research: a follow-up study. *JAMA Network Open*. 2018;1(1):e180156.
<https://jamanetwork.com/journals/jamanetworkopen/fullarticle/2680418>

Dakin H, Abel L, Burns R, Yang Y. Review and critical appraisal of studies mapping from quality of life or clinical measures to EQ-5D: an online database and application of the MAPS statement. *Health Qual Life Outcomes*. 2018 Feb 12;16(1):31.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5810002/>

Enticott J, Buck K, Shawyer F. Finding "hard to find" literature on hard to find groups: a novel technique to search grey literature on refugees and asylum seekers. *Int J Methods Psychiatr Res*. 2018 Mar;27(1).
Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28868640>

Faggion CM Jr, Huiuin R, Aranda L, Pandis N, Alarcon M. The search and selection for primary studies in systematic reviews published in dental journals indexed in MEDLINE was not fully reproducible. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2018 Jun;98:53-61.
Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29476922>

Garner P, Hopewell S, Chandler J, MacLehose H, Schünemann HJ, Akl EA, et al. When and how to update systematic reviews: consensus and checklist. *BMJ*. 2016 Jul 20;354:i3507.
<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4955793/>

Glanville J, Wood H. Text mining opportunities: white paper. Ottawa: CADTH; 2018 May.
<https://cadth.ca/text-mining-opportunities-white-paper>

Glocker K, Knurr A, Dieter J, Dominick F, Forche M, Koch C, Pascoe Pérez A, Roth B, Ückert F. Optimizing a query by transformation and expansion. *Stud Health Technol Inform*. 2017;243:197-201.
<http://ebooks.iospress.nl/publication/47536>

Goossen K, Tenckhoff S, Probst P, Grummich K, Mihaljevic AL, Büchler MW, Diener MK. Optimal literature search for systematic reviews in surgery. *Langenbecks Arch Surg*. 2018 Feb;403(1):119-29.
Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29209758>

Grindlay DJ, Karantana A. Putting the 'systematic' into searching - tips and resources for search strategies in systematic reviews. *J Hand Surg Eur Vol*. 2018 Jul;43(6):674-8.
First page preview: <http://journals.sagepub.com/doi/abs/10.1177/1753193418778978>

Harris JL, Booth A, Cargo M, Hannes K, Harden A, Flemming K, Garside R, Pantoja T, Thomas J, Noyes J. Cochrane Qualitative and Implementation Methods Group guidance series - paper 2: methods for question formulation, searching, and protocol development for qualitative evidence synthesis. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2018 May;97:39-48.
Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29248725>

Isojarvi J, Wood H, Lefebvre C, Glanville J. Challenges of identifying unpublished data from clinical trials: getting the best out of clinical trials registers and other novel sources. *Res Synth Methods*. 2018 Feb 7. Epub ahead of print.
Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/29411948>

Lam MT, De Longhi C, Turnbull J, Lam HR, Besa R. Has Embase replaced MEDLINE since coverage expansion? *J Med Libr Assoc.* 2018 Apr;106(2):227-34.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5886505/>

Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Beale S, Boachie C, Duffy S, Fraser C, Harbour J, McCool R, Smith L. Assessing the performance of methodological search filters to improve the efficiency of evidence information retrieval: five literature reviews and a qualitative study. *Health Technol Assess.* 2017 Nov;21(69):1-148.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta21690>

Luhnen M, Prediger B, Neugebauer EAM, Mathes T. Systematic reviews of health economic evaluations: a protocol for a systematic review of characteristics and methods applied. *Syst. Rev* 2017 Dec 2;6(1):238.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5712099/>

Lunny C, Brennan SE, McDonald S, McKenzie JE. Toward a comprehensive evidence map of overview of systematic review methods: paper 1—purpose, eligibility, search and data extraction. *Syst Rev.* 2017 Nov 21;6(1):231.

<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-017-0617-1>

Marasović T, Utrobičić A, Marušić A. Transparency of retracting and replacing articles. *Lancet.* 2018 Mar 31;391(10127):1244-5.

No abstract available.

Mertz M, Strech D, Kahrass H. What methods do reviews of normative ethics literature use for search, selection, analysis, and synthesis? In-depth results from a systematic review of reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2017 Dec 19;6(1):261.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5738202/>

Nussbaumer-Streit B, Klerings I, Wagner G, Heise TL, Dobrescu AI, Armijo-Olivo S, Stratil JM, Persad E, Lhachimi SK, Van Noord MG, Mittermayr T, Zeeb H, Hemkens L, Gartlehner G. Abbreviated literature searches were viable alternatives to comprehensive searches: a meta-epidemiological study. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2018 Jun 1. Epub ahead of print.

<https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0895435618300179>

Przybyła P, Brockmeier AJ, Kontonatsios G, Le Pogam MA, McNaught J, von Elm E, Nolan K, Ananiadou S. Prioritising references for systematic reviews with RobotAnalyst: a user study. *Res Synth Methods.* 2018 Jun 28. Epub ahead of print.

<https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/epdf/10.1002/jrsm.1311>

Rathbone J, Albarqouni L, Bakhit M, Beller E, Byambasuren O, Hoffmann T, Scott AM, Glasziou P. Expediting citation screening using PICO-based title-only screening for identifying studies in scoping searches and rapid reviews. *Syst Rev.* 2017 Nov 25;6(1):233.

<https://systematicreviewsjournal.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s13643-017-0629-x>

Rice M, Ali MU, Fitzpatrick-Lewis D, Kenny M, Raina P, Sherifali D. Testing the effectiveness of simplified search strategies for updating systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol.* 2017 Aug;88:148-53.

Abstract: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/28625563>

Shamseer L, Moher D, Maduekwe O, Turner L, Barbour V, Burch R, Clark J, Galipeau J, Roberts J, Shea BJ. Potential predatory and legitimate biomedical journals: can you tell the difference? A cross-sectional comparison. *BMC Med.* 2017 Mar 16;15(1):28.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5353955/>

Singh Chawla D. The undercover academic keeping tabs on 'predatory' publishing. *Nature.* 2018 Mar 16.

<https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-02921-2>

Swauger S. Open access, power, and privilege: a response to "What I learned from predatory publishing." *C & RL News.* 2017 Dec;78(11):603-6.

<https://crln.acrl.org/index.php/crlnews/article/view/16837/18434>

Tse T, Fain KM, Zarin DA. How to avoid common problems when using ClinicalTrials.gov in research: 10 issues to consider. *BMJ*. 2018;361:k1452.

<https://www.bmj.com/content/361/bmj.k1452>

Wexler P, Judson R, de Marcellus S, de Knecht J, Leinala E. Health effects of toxicants: online knowledge support. *Life Sci*. 2016 Jan 15;145:284-93.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC4744126/>

Wolf K, Yu A, Ide N, Williams RJ, Tse T. ClinicalTrials.gov: further enhancements to functionality. *NLM Tech Bull*. 2017 Nov-Dec;(419):e9.

https://www.nlm.nih.gov/pubs/techbull/nd17/nd17_clinicaltrials_enhanced.html

Yu T, Enkh-Amgalan N, Zorigt G. Methods to perform systematic reviews of patient preferences: a literature survey. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2017;17:166.

<https://bmcmmedresmethodol.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/s12874-017-0448-8>

Zwierzyna M, Davies M, Hingorani AD, Hunter J. Clinical trial design and dissemination: comprehensive analysis of clinicaltrials.gov and PubMed data since 2005. *BMJ*. 2018 Jun 6;361:k2130.

<https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5989153/>

Publication Spotlight

A comment by Dr. Siw Waffenschmidt on:

Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Beale S, Boachie C, Duffy S, Fraser C, Harbour J, McCool R, Smith L. Assessing the performance of methodological search filters to improve the efficiency of evidence information retrieval: five literature reviews and a qualitative study. *Health Technol Assess*. 2017 Nov;21(69):1-148.

<https://dx.doi.org/10.3310/hta21690>

In November 2017 Lefebvre et al. published an HTA report on methods for developing and applying study filters. For this purpose, they systematically searched, screened and assessed the literature on the topic and also conducted qualitative interviews regarding the applicability of study filters.

The report by Lefebvre et al. is highly relevant for information specialists: For example, it contains an analysis of the performance measures used for diagnostic tests, with guidance on how these measures could be applied to study filters. A further important aspect is their approach for calculating sample sizes in the development of study filters. With their report, Lefebvre et al. have created a methodological standard that will be used in the development of new study filters as well as in the selection and application of existing ones. In my opinion, the report presents a milestone in the literature on information retrieval.

Websites of Interest

Polyglot Search

<http://crebp-sra.com/#/polyglot>

From the website: The Polyglot Search Syntax Translator (PSST) has been designed to make the translation of search strategies across databases easier. It is important to note that it does not remove the need to understand how the databases work altogether. A key thing to be aware of is that the PSST does not automatically map subject terms such as MeSH across databases. Therefore in order for your searches to be as effective as possible you will still need to look up appropriate subject terms yourself. Produced as part of the Systematic Review Accelerator by Bond University and the Centre for Research in Evidence-Based Practice (CREBP).

News item: Justin Clark of Polyglot Search to be awarded a Health Libraries Australia (HLA) Ann Harrison Award in July 2018.

From the award administrators: The Polyglot Search Translator has been developed to improve the speed and quality of literature searching for systematic reviews. In phase 1, the PST was developed for in-house use. In phase 2, it was developed for use by Australian and

international librarians and information specialists. Phase 3 aims to improve the usability and functionality of the PST by incorporating feedback from phase 2. Suggested enhancements will be developed, along with new cross reference translation libraries and test kits. PST version 3 will be trialled before being rolled out to live servers, free to everyone in the world. Note: Funding from the HLA/Medical Director Digital Health Innovation Award will be directed towards the evaluation of phase 3.

1findr

www.1findr.com

From the website: 1findr aims to grow into the best and most comprehensive abstract indexing system based on expertly curated content. 1findr starts with the world's most comprehensive list of refereed journals and contains thousands of journals typically absent from existing collections and discovery systems. 1findr is by far the most cost-effective way to expand your collection. It makes use of 1findr link resolver technology, which means that more than 27 million articles published in peer-reviewed journals are directly accessible for download, for free. 1findr radically reduces the time it takes to locate and download papers published in peer-reviewed journals. With 1findr you will quickly find yourself using fee-based & freely accessible scholarly articles, provided they are published in peer-reviewed journals. Two versions are available: free edition and institutional edition. More information available at: <http://1science.com/1findr/>

PredicTER

<https://estech.shinyapps.io/predicter/>

From the website: PredicTER is a software tool to help researchers and practitioners estimate the length of time necessary to complete a systematic review (SR) or systematic map (SM). All stages of the SR and SM processes are included by default, as listed in the guidelines of the Collaboration for Environmental Evidence (CEE). Default values for each input are taken from a survey of environmental evidence synthesis practitioners conducted by Neal Haddaway. PredicTER was designed by Neal Haddaway (Stockholm Environment Institute) and Martin Westgate (Australian National University). This implementation was written by Martin Westgate.

Library of PCOR Resources

<https://www.ahrq.gov/pcor/library-of-resources/>

From the website: The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) is providing this comprehensive Web library of patient-centered outcomes research (PCOR) resources to draw attention to the existing collection of PCOR projects conducted by public, private, nonprofit, and academic sources. The library of resources includes PCOR findings and evidence-based tools that have appeared in the published literature as well as studies and projects that are in progress. The information is intended to assist researchers who may be conducting new studies, as well as clinicians, policymakers, consumers, and others who are seeking access to evidence-based health information.

News item: INAHTA progresses work to relaunch the international HTA database

The international HTA database (<https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/CRDWeb/>) has been generously produced by the NIHR and housed at the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination for many years now. Due to some changes within the NIHR, the International Network of Agencies for Health Technology Assessment (INAHTA) (<http://www.inahta.org/>) was called upon to take action to ensure the continued production of this important database. Many INAHTA members use this database to disseminate their reports and search for reports from other jurisdictions.

INAHTA is now in the process of rebuilding the database and they are working hard to advance this project quickly but also to take the time necessary to have it done right. INAHTA wishes to be sure the new database will meet the needs of INAHTA members and the broader HTA community that use this important international resource. The database remains available but new records are being held in a queue to be added once the new version is available. Stay tuned for further updates! Enquiries may be directed to the INAHTA secretariat at INAHTA@ihe.ca.

National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC)

<https://www.guideline.gov/>

Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) announcement of July 2, 2018:

The AHRQ National Guideline Clearinghouse (NGC, [guideline.gov](http://www.guideline.gov)) Web site will not be available after July 16, 2018 because federal funding through AHRQ will no longer be available to support the NGC as of that date. AHRQ is receiving expressions of interest from stakeholders interested in carrying on

NGC's work. It is not clear at this time, however, when or if NGC (or something like NGC) will be online again. In addition, AHRQ has not yet determined whether, or to what extent, the Agency would have an ongoing role if a stakeholder were to continue to operate the NGC. We will continue to post summaries of new and updated evidence-based clinical practice guidelines until July 2, 2018. For any questions, please contact Mary.Nix@ahrq.hhs.gov.

IRG Member Activities

IRG Profile: Tom Macmillan

Tom was recently appointed as the Technical Officer for the IRG, a new role in which he will support the administrative function of the group. He will arrange meetings for the executive committee, help to organise workshops and manage web content for the IRG sections of the HTAi website, as well as other tasks.

Tom is the information specialist at the King's Technology Evaluation Centre (KiTEC) at King's College London. KiTEC is an external assessment centre for NICE on the Medical Technologies Evaluation Program carrying out HTAs, systematic reviews, rapid reviews, guidance updates and research projects on medical devices. Tom is responsible for all information retrieval activities at KiTEC as well as report writing and other aspects of HTA. He previously worked for the Royal College of Surgeons of England on systematic reviews for the National Surgical Commissioning Centre. He holds an MSc in Information Management and a BA in English Literature and Linguistics. His master's thesis examined knowledge management and organisational learning in public sector environments.



If you are a member of the HTAi Information Retrieval interest group and would like to share your research activities with other IRG members in this newsletter, please contact DavidK@cadth.ca.

The IRG eNewsletter is put together by the following Information Retrieval Group members: David Kaunelis (Canada); Catherine Voutier (Australia); Dagmara Chojecki (Canada); and Jaana Isojärvi (Finland). Have any events, news, or interesting papers or websites you want to share? Just email DavidK@cadth.ca.