



National Institute for Public Health
and the Environment
Ministry of Health, Welfare and Sport

CHRODIS+ Employment and chronic conditions

Workplan Task 8.2 –
Literature study



Toolkit – aim and domains

- Aim:
 - To develop and pilot a Toolkit to support employers in understanding the health benefits of health promotion and prevention of CD and the potential of workplaces to implement preventive activities by adapting the workplace
- 3 domains:
 - 1) Promotion of healthy lifestyle habits
 - 2) Prevention of CD among workers at risk
 - 3) Enhancing work participation of workers with CD



Workplan – Literature study



Steps in literature search of reviews

1. Review search
2. Review selection
3. Data extraction
4. Quality assessment

See: Smith ea 2011

Smith *et al.* *BMC Medical Research Methodology* 2011, **11**:15
<http://www.biomedcentral.com/1471-2288/11/15>



RESEARCH ARTICLE

Open Access

Methodology in conducting a systematic review of systematic reviews of healthcare interventions

Valerie Smith^{1*}, Declan Devane², Cecily M Begley¹, Mike Clarke³

Abstract

Background: Hundreds of studies of maternity care interventions have been published, too many for most people involved in providing maternity care to identify and consider when making decisions. It became apparent that systematic reviews of individual studies were required to appraise, summarise and bring together existing studies in a single place. However, decision makers are increasingly faced by a plethora of such reviews and these are likely to be of variable quality and scope, with more than one review of important topics. Systematic reviews (or overviews) of reviews are a logical and appropriate next step, allowing the findings of separate reviews to be



1. Review search

- in several electronic databases, i.e. EMBASE.com (i.e. Embase and medline), PsycINFO, and the Cochrane Library
- Criteria:
 - reviews only
 - from 2009-2018
 - Published in English
- Separate search for the 3 domains, but similar approach



2. Review selection

- Assess retrieved titles and abstracts for relevance
- Independent selection by two persons
- Check inclusion criteria based on title, abstract, then full texts



3. Data extraction

- Summary table to describe each review included
 - Year of publication
 - Outcome(s) measured
 - Population (setting)
 - Intervention
 - Number of studies included
 - Number of study participants



4. Quality assessment



Journal of Clinical Epidemiology 62 (2009) 1013–1020

**Journal of
Clinical
Epidemiology**

AMSTAR is a reliable and valid measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews

Beverley J. Shea^{a,b,c,*}, Candyce Hamel^a, George A. Wells^{d,e}, Lex M. Bouter^b, Elizabeth Kristjansson^f, Jeremy Grimshaw^g, David A. Henry^h, Maarten Boers^c

^aCommunity Information and Epidemiological Technologies (CIET), Institute of Population Health, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

^bInstitute for Research in Extramural Medicine (EMGO Institute), VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^cDepartment of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, VU University Medical Center, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^dOttawa Heart Institute, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

^eDepartment of Epidemiology and Community Medicine, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

^fFaculty of Social Sciences, School of Psychology, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

^gClinical Epidemiology Program, Department of Medicine, Ottawa Health Research Institute, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Ontario, Canada

^hInstitute for Clinical Evaluative Sciences, Toronto, Ontario, Canada

Accepted 29 October 2008



AMSTAR

- 11 items

Assessment of the interrater agreement for AMSTAR

Items

1. Was an “a priori” design provided?
2. Was there duplicate study selection and data extraction?
3. Was a comprehensive literature search performed?
4. Was the status of publication (i.e., grey literature) used as an inclusion criterion?
5. Was a list of studies (included and excluded) provided?
6. Were the characteristics of the included studies provided?
7. Was the scientific quality of the included studies assessed and documented?
8. Was the scientific quality of the included studies used appropriately in formulating conclusions?
9. Were the methods used to combine the findings of studies appropriate?
10. Was the likelihood of publication bias assessed?
11. Were potential conflicts of interest included?



Type of review

- Suggestion to perform a **scoping meta-review** (see *Sarrami-Foroushani et al., 2015*)
- Scoping meta-review combines aspects of a scoping review and a meta-review to establish an evidence-based map of a field

Scoping Meta-Review: Introducing a New Methodology

Pooria Sarrami-Foroushani, M.D., Ph.D.¹, Joanne Travaglia, Ph.D.^{1,2}, Deborah Debono, R.N., R.M., B.A.¹, Robyn Clay-Williams, Ph.D.¹, and Jeffrey Braithwaite, Ph.D.¹

Abstract

For researchers, policymakers, and practitioners facing a new field, undertaking a systematic review can typically present a challenge due to the enormous number of relevant papers. A scoping review is a method suggested for addressing this dilemma; however, scoping reviews present their own challenges. This paper introduces the “scoping meta-review” (SMR) for expanding current methodologies and is based on our experiences in mapping the field of consumer engagement in healthcare. During this process, we developed the novel SMR method. An SMR combines aspects of a scoping review and a meta-review to establish an evidence-based map of a field. Similar to a scoping review, an SMR offers a practical and flexible methodology. However, unlike in a traditional scoping review, only systematic reviews are included. Stages of the SMR include: undertaking a preliminary nonsystematic review; building a search strategy; interrogating academic literature databases; classifying and excluding studies based on titles and abstracts; saving the refined database of references; revising the search strategy; selecting and reviewing the full text papers; and thematically analyzing the selected texts and writing the report. The main benefit of an SMR is to map a new field based on high-level evidence provided by systematic reviews. *Clin Trans Sci* 2015; Volume 8: 77–81

Keywords: scoping meta-review (SMR), scoping review, meta-review, systematic review, literature review, methodology

Background

Despite the astonishing advances in electronic databases and are suggested for a scoping review.⁴ For example, it can be



Scoping meta-review

- Enables to deepen our insight into the type of interventions (a description of the content of interventions) rather than only focus on the effectiveness of the workplace interventions

	A systematic review, such as a meta-review	A scoping review	A scoping meta-review (SMR)
Aim of the study	To address very specific research questions	To deal with broader topics	To deal with broader topics
Types of included studies	Limited to particular types of studies (meta-reviews are limited to systematic reviews)	Might include different types of studies	Limited to systematic reviews
Quality appraisal of the included studies	Quality appraisal is done and results are presented based on the weight and quality of evidence	Does not evaluate quality of the included studies	Quality appraisal is done to explore the methodology of studies and excluding nonsystematic reviews
Analysis and reporting the results	Synthesizes evidence and aggregates findings	Undertakes thematic construction and creates a narrative to summarize the results	Undertakes thematic construction and creates a narrative to summarize the results
Study selection	Study selection is based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria that are set at the beginning of the study	Criteria are developed gradually while familiarity with literature is increased	Study selection is based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria that are set at the beginning of the study, but are open to revision
Comprehensive	Attempts to include all relevant materials	Attempts to be as comprehensive as possible, but also consider cost and time limitation; e.g., there might be a time deadline for inclusion of studies	Attempts to be as comprehensive as possible, but also consider practical limitations and may exclude older systematic reviews

Table 1. Differences between a systematic review, a scoping review, and a scoping meta-review (SMR).

