Identifying Cochrane Reviews that should be included in Evidence Aid (informed by users of Evidence Aid)

Claire Allen
Knowledge Manager
Aim of this process

To match systematic reviews with the priorities of users of Evidence Aid by:

– identifying Cochrane Reviews (including registered titles, protocols and full reviews) that are relevant to Evidence Aid;

– identifying non-Cochrane systematic reviews that are relevant to Evidence Aid; and

– minimising the burden on Cochrane Review Groups and potential users of Evidence Aid by doing initial screening centrally.
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Step One

• Checked all registered titles, protocols and full reviews in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews up to and including Issue 9, 2011 for those of potential relevance to Evidence Aid, adding a provisional code for the type of disaster.

• This is an over-inclusive list to begin with (the aim being to eliminate Cochrane Reviews that are irrelevant to Evidence Aid from the more than 7000 records).

Claire Allen, Knowledge Manager, Evidence Aid
Step One - Types of Disaster

- **Geological disasters**: Avalanches / Earthquakes / Volcanic eruptions / Mining disasters
- **Water-related disasters**: Floods / Limnic eruptions / Tsunamis
- **Weather-related disasters**: Blizzards / Cyclonic storms / Droughts / Hailstorms / Heatwaves / Tornados / Storms / Lightening / Winter freeze
Step One - Types of Disaster (cont.d)

- Wildfires and bushfires
- Health disasters: Epidemics (communicable diseases) / Famines
- Conflict-related disasters: War / Civil War / Genocide
- Space disasters: Impact events / Solar flares / Gamma ray burst
- Radiation emergencies
Output from Step One  
(*mid September 2011*)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Potentially relevant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full reviews</td>
<td>4565</td>
<td>519 (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protocols</td>
<td>2040</td>
<td>217 (10.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Titles</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>49 (6.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Step Two

• Independent check of the list of identified Cochrane Reviews to remove any that are not relevant (four people).

• Identification of important gaps in the topics, which might require a re-check of all Cochrane Reviews in case relevant reviews were missed.
Step Three

• Send a list of their Cochrane Reviews to each of three Cochrane Review Groups to pilot a process to reduce the list further.

• Asking them to remove any reviews, protocols or registered titles that are not applicable, and if any Cochrane Reviews have been missed.
Step Four

- Refine the process using feedback from step three.
Step Five

• Send the lists of their Cochrane Reviews to each Cochrane Review Group for their input.

• Ask them to identify someone within the Cochrane Review Group who would be willing to be a contact point for Evidence Aid.
Step Six

• Discuss the lists of potentially relevant Cochrane Reviews and their priorities with organisations involved in disaster risk reduction, planning and response to:
  – refine the lists;
  – code the reviews for relevance to different topics;
  and
  – identify important gaps where reviews are needed.
Step Seven

• Develop a database of Cochrane Reviews (at all stages of preparation) and other systematic reviews for Evidence Aid, containing:
  – codes to show which aspects of natural disasters and humanitarian emergencies they are relevant to (in association with topic specific groups);
  – how up to date they are; and
  – details of how they could be updated urgently if necessary.
Access to Evidence Aid

For more information:

- Website: www.EvidenceAid.org
- Twitter: @evidenceaid
- E-mail: callen@evidenceaid.org
- Skype: claireallencochrane
- Facebook: Will be available in late October 2011

Thank you for listening!

Claire Allen, Knowledge Manager, Evidence Aid
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