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Why?

Year on year increase in 1 to 1 support sessions:
2018-19: 296 sessions, 188 hours (21st June)
2017-18: 280 sessions, 158 hours
2016-17: 190 session, 105 hours

Clear demand for direct support

Researcher awareness of the service = increase in requests for collaboration

Quality of local SR searches = not as good as it should be
Other evidence

SR processes are highly synergistic - rigorous work earlier facilitates better progress later (Johnson, 2019)

90% of the reviews analysed had search errors. 78% of these affect recall (Salvador-Olivan, 2019)

Studies found that SRs with librarian collaboration = higher quality of reporting (Rethlefsen, 2015; Meert, 2016)
Our journey at LSHTM

Always offered literature search support via training and advice
Structured and reflectively developed year on year
Direct research support = ad hoc with occasional collaboration when approached
2 members of staff (1 to 1s)
Manager: SR collaborations
(Plus training & other duties)
PRESS

P = PEER
R = REVIEW of
E = ELECTRONIC
S = SEARCH
S = STRATEGIES

PRESS has been around since 2008, updated in 2016 (McGowan, 2016)

An idea!
Structured framework to build new search strategy review service
Questions used to interrogate search strategy

Translation of the search strategy into search concepts

- Does the search strategy match the research question/PICO?
- Are the search concepts clear and well defined?
- Is there a simpler way the search concepts could be defined?
- Are there too many or too few PICO elements included?
- Are the search concepts too broad or too narrow?
- Does the search retrieve too many or too few records?
- Are unconventional or complex strategies explained?

Sources

- Do the sources chosen to search cover an unbiased selection of the available literature?
- If required, are grey literature, conference proceedings, trials registers or unpublished works captured by searching these sources?
- Are there too many or too few sources included?
- Are any key sources missing?

Boolean operators

- Are Boolean operators used correctly?
- Is the use of nesting with parentheses appropriate and effective for the search?
- If NOT is used, is this likely to result in any unintended exclusions?

Proximity operators

- Are proximity operators used correctly?
- Could the search be improved by using proximity operators instead of AND?
- Is the width of proximity operators suitable (eg adj5 as opposed to adj3 or adj10)?

Subject headings

- Are the subject headings used relevant?
- Are any additional subject headings missing?
- Are any subject headings too broad/too narrow?
- Are subject headings exploded where necessary and vice-versa? Are all exploded headings relevant?
- Are subheadings used appropriately/missing?

Text word searching

- Have all relevant synonyms, related terms and antonyms been searched?
- Are text word searches included appropriate – eg too broad, too narrow?
- Are truncation/wildcards used appropriately?
- Are acronyms or abbreviations, and the full phrases of these, used appropriately?
- Have the appropriate fields been searched (eg tw, mp)?

Spelling

- Are there any spelling errors?
- Are alternative spellings of words included?

Search limits

- Are limits used appropriately and are they relevant given the research question?
- Are any potentially helpful limits missing?

Search syntax

- Are the correct symbols and syntax used for the database?
- Are line numbers combined together correctly?
- are there any orphan line numbers?
- Has the search strategy been adapted for each database (if details provided)?
Now: search review service

March 2019 – launched new service

Submit lit search for review (PRESS):
• MSc Projects / PGR / Staff
• One database only
• Require protocol / topic details
• Response within 5 working days

19 PRESS reviews to date
Take between 30 mins to 2 hours
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4. Proximity operators

A - No Revisions
B - Revision(s) suggested XXXXX
C - Revision(s) required

Comments
These look to have been used correctly (NB – you can delete link 26 as this is covered by line 25, but I'm guessing you wanted to see how much was picked with just vitamin adj d^*).

5. Subject headings

A - No Revisions
B - Revision(s) suggested XXXXX
C - Revision(s) required

Comments
You seem to have considered subject headings for all of your keyword terms and exploded them where relevant. NB - subject headings are not required for Web of Science & SCOPUS databases, and many grey_lit sources do not use them. This is just a reminder that they should be included where appropriate and amended for each database (as they may use different subject headings).

6. Text word searching

A - No Revisions
B - Revision(s) suggested XXXXX
C - Revision(s) required

Comments
It looks like you have enhanced your keywords across all elements of your search concepts and included 'used for' terms from subject heading definitions, which is good. I would suggest perhaps running your list of keyword terms past your collaborators for a double-check to see if anyone suggest anything else. I would also suggest checking any known articles that you have to make sure relevant keywords from their title/abstract/keyword list/subject heading list have been included too.
Now: SR collaborations

Request collaboration on Systematic Review (staff only)
Costed (per hour)
LSHTM Librarians as named author
Researcher submits details/protocol
Researcher selects areas of required input

Request a collaboration

Complete this form if you would like to sub-contract a librarian to work with you on a systematic review.
A librarian will contact you within two working days to discuss capacity within the Library team, and details of your review.

Costs are calculated per hour and depend on the size and complexity of the review.
This service is only available for reviews where a current member of LSHTM staff is a named author.

Title of your project *
Name of PI and their institution (if not LSHTM) *
Name of funder *
What type of review are you planning to conduct? *
- Systematic review
- Scoping review
- Rapid review
- Realist review
- Umbrella review (review of reviews)
- Update of an existing review
- Other
Now: SR collaborations

Request collaboration on Systematic Review (staff only)

Costed (per hour)

LSHTM Librarians as named author

Researcher submits details/protocol

Researcher selects areas of required input
Pilot period
Not heavily promoted to date:
• Training
• 1 to 1s
• Enquiry desk
• Word of mouth

2 members of staff: PRESS reviews.
Myself & manager: Sys Review collaborations
(Plus training & other duties)
Next steps

Promotion:
• All user email
• Dept meetings
• Promote in teaching (integral part of follow on support)
• Offer more 1 to 1s

Review the services:
• Final draft of search?
• One shot for MScs?
• Multiple submissions for PGR/staff?
• How many SR collaborations?
Challenges

Difficult to guess at time involved
Workloads!
Managing expectations
Access to relevant resources
Developing research methods – realist reviews
Access to materials / sharing materials
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Thank you.
email: russell.burke@lshtm.ac.uk

Any questions?