

References for NIH Office of Disease Prevention webinar

July 25, 2016

Kay Dickersin

Slides

1. Pai M, McCulloch M, Gorman JD, et al. Systematic reviews and meta-analyses: an illustrated, step-by-step guide. *Natl Med J India* 2004;17(2):86-95.
2. Institute of Medicine. Finding what works in health care: standards for systematic reviews. March 23, 2011. Available at: <http://www.iom.edu/Reports/2011/Finding-What-Works-in-Health-Care-Standards-for-Systematic-Reviews.aspx>
3. Institute of Medicine. Clinical practice guidelines we can trust. March 23, 2011. Available at: <http://www.nationalacademies.org/hmd/Reports/2011/Clinical-Practice-Guidelines-We-Can-Trust.aspx>
4. Higgins JPT, Green S. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions* (version 5.1.0). Available at: <http://www.cochrane-handbook.org/>
5. Dijkers, M. KT Update (Vol. 4, No. 1 – December 2015) Available at: <http://ktdrr.org/products/update/v4n1>
6. Tricco A, Soobiah C, Antony J, Cogo E, MacDonald H, Lillie E, Tran J, D'Souza J, Hui W, Perrier L, Welch V, Horsley T, Straus SE, Kastner M. A scoping review identifies multiple emerging knowledge synthesis methods, but few studies operationalize the method. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology* 73: 19e28. Published online: February 15, 2016. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jclinepi.2015.08.030>
7. Chandler J, Churchill R, Higgins J, Tovey D. Methodological standards for the conduct of new Cochrane Intervention Reviews. Version 2.2. 17 December 2012 – Available at: http://www.editorial-unit.cochrane.org/sites/editorial-unit.cochrane.org/files/uploads/MECIR_conduct_standards%202.2%2017122012.pdf
8. Sterne JAC, Higgins JPT, Reeves BC on behalf of the development group for ACROBAT-NRSI> Version 1.0.0, 24 September 2014. A Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool: for non-randomized studies of interventions (ACROBAT-NRSI).
9. Goodman S, Dickersin K. Metabias: a challenge for comparative effectiveness research. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011 Jul 5;155(1):61-2. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-1-201107050-00010. PubMed PMID: 21727295.
10. Vedula SS, Bero L, Scherer RW, Dickersin K. Outcome reporting in industry-sponsored trials of gabapentin for off-label use. *New England Journal of Medicine* 361:1963-71, 2009.
11. Li T, Vedula SS, Scherer R, Dickersin K. What comparative effectiveness research is needed? A framework for using guidelines and systematic reviews to identify evidence gaps and research priorities. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 156(5):367-77, 2012.

Optional references

Systematic reviews, generally

1. Antman EM, Lau J, Kupelnick B, et.al. A comparison of results of meta-analyses of randomized control trials and recommendations of clinical experts. *Treatments for myocardial infarction*. *JAMA*. 1992; 268: 240–48.

2. Cook DJ, Mulrow CD, Haynes RB. Systematic reviews: synthesis of best evidence for clinical decisions. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 1997; 126: 376-380.
3. Dickersin K, Manheimer E. The Cochrane Collaboration: evaluation of health care and services using systematic reviews of the results of randomized controlled trials. *Clinical Obstetrics and Gynecology*. 1998; 41(2): 315-31.
4. Dickersin K. Systematic reviews in epidemiology: why are we so far behind? *International Journal of Epidemiology*. 2002; 31: 6-12.
5. Harris RP, Helfand M, Woolf SH. Current methods of the U.S. Preventive Services Task Force. A review of the process. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*. 2001; 20(3S): 21-35.
6. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Methods guide for medical test reviews. Paper 2: Developing the topic and structuring the review: utility of PICOTS, analytic frameworks, decision trees, and other frameworks. Available at: http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/248/560/Paper02_%28Developing%29%29_Oct_10.pdf

Formulating the question

7. Counsell C. Formulating questions and locating primary studies for inclusion in systematic reviews. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 1997; 127 (5): 380-87.
8. Rios LP, Ye C, Thabane L. Association between framing of the research question using the PICOT format and reporting quality of randomized controlled trials. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2010 Feb 5;10:11.
9. Whitlock EP, Orleans CT, Pender N, Allan J. Evaluating primary care behavioral counseling interventions: an evidence-based approach. *Am J Prev Med*. 2002 May;22(4):267-84.
10. Saldanha IJ, Dickersin K, Wang X, Li T. Outcomes in Cochrane systematic reviews addressing four common eye conditions: an evaluation of completeness and comparability. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(10):e109400.

Reporting biases

1. Dickersin K, Manheimer E, Wieland S, et.al. Development of The Cochrane Collaboration's central register of controlled clinical trials. *Evaluation & the Health Professions*. 2002; 25(1): 38-64.
2. Olson CM, Rennie D, Cook D, et al. Publication bias in editorial decision making. *JAMA*. 2002; 287: 2825-28.
3. Hopewell S, Clarke M, Lefebvre C, Scherer R. Handsearching versus electronic searching to identify reports of randomized trials. *Cochrane Database of Methodology Reviews* 2002, Issue 4. Art. No.: MR000001. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000001.
4. Dickersin K, Rennie D. Registering clinical trials. *JAMA* 2003; 290: 516-23.
5. DeAngelis CD, Drazen JM, Frizelle FA. Is this clinical trial fully registered? A statement from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. *JAMA*. 2005; 293(23): 1-3.
6. Wieland S, Dickersin K. Selective exposure reporting and Medline indexing limited the search sensitivity for observational studies of the adverse effects of oral contraceptives. *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*. 2005; 58: 560-67.

7. Hopewell S, Loudon K, Clarke MJ, Oxman AD, Dickersin K. Publication bias in clinical trials due to statistical significance or direction of trial results. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2009, Issue 1. Art. No.: MR000006. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000006.pub3.
8. Robinson KA, Goodman SN. A systematic examination of the citation of prior research in reports of randomized, controlled trials. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011 Jan 4; 154(1):50-5.
9. Dickersin K, Rennie D. The evolution of trial registries and their use to assess the clinical trial enterprise (editorial). *JAMA*. 307:1861-4; 2012.

Finding the evidence – Searching principles

1. Derry S, Loke YK, Aronson JK. Incomplete evidence: the inadequacy of databases in tracing published adverse drug reactions in clinical trials. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2001;1:7.
2. Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB; Hedges Team. Developing optimal search strategies for detecting clinically sound prognostic studies in MEDLINE: an analytic survey. *BMC Med*. 2004 Jun 9;2:23.
3. Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Developing optimal search strategies for detecting clinically sound prognostic studies in EMBASE: an analytic survey. *J Am Med Inform Assoc*. 2005 Jul-Aug;12(4):481-5.
4. Sampson M, McGowan J. Errors in search strategies were identified by type and frequency. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2006 Oct;59(10):1057-63. Epub 2006 Jun 23.
5. Wong SS, Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Developing optimal search strategies for detecting clinically sound treatment studies in EMBASE. *J Med Libr Assoc*. 2006 Jan; 94(1):41-7.
6. Sampson M, McGowan J, Lefebvre C, Moher D, Grimshaw J. *PRESS: Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies*. Ottawa: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2008.

Assessing risk of bias in included studies

1. Moher D, Jones A, Cook DJ, et al. Does the quality of reports of randomized trials affect estimates of intervention efficacy reported in meta-analyses? *Lancet*. 1998; 352: 609-13.
2. Juni P, Witschi A, Bloch R, Egger M. The hazards of scoring the quality of clinical trials for meta-analysis. *JAMA*. 1999; 282: 1054-60.
3. Altman DG, Schulz KF, Moher D, et.al. The revised CONSORT statement for reporting randomized trials: explanation and elaboration. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2001; 134: 663-94.
4. Gluud LL. Bias in clinical intervention research. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 2006; 163: 493-501.
5. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et.al., for the STROBE initiative. The Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *Lancet*. 2007; 370: 1453-57.
6. Vandebroucke JP, von Elm E, Altman DG, et al., for the STROBE Initiative. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE): explanation and elaboration. *PLoS Medicine*. 2007; 4(10): e297.
7. Pildal J, Hróbjartsson A, Jørgensen KJ, Hilden J, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC. Impact of allocation concealment on conclusions drawn from meta-analyses of randomized trials. *Int J Epidemiol*. 2007 Aug; 36(4):847-57. Epub 2007 May 21.

8. Schulz KF, Altman DG, Moher D. CONSORT 2010 statement: Updated guidelines for reporting parallel group randomised trials. *J Pharmacol Pharmacother*. 2010 Jul; 1(2):100-7.
9. Falck-Ytter Y, Schünemann H, Guyatt G. AHRQ series commentary 1: rating the evidence in comparative effectiveness reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2010 May;63(5):474-5. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2010.01.003. Epub 2010 Feb 26. PubMed PMID: 20189352.
10. Wells G, Shea B, O'Connell J, Robertson J, Peterson V, Welch V, Losos M, Tugwell P. The Newcastle-Ottawa Scale (NOS) for assessing the quality of nonrandomised studies in meta-analysis. [http://www.ohri.ca/programs/clinical_epidemiology/oxford.Asp]
11. Odgaard-Jensen J, Vist GE, Timmer A, Kunz R, Akl EA, Schünemann H, Briel M, Nordmann AJ, Pregno S, Oxman AD. Randomisation to protect against selection bias in healthcare trials. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2011 Apr 13; (4):MR000012. doi: 10.1002/14651858.MR000012.pub3. Review. PubMed PMID: 21491415.

Minimizing metabias in a systematic review

1. Berlin JA, on behalf of the University of Pennsylvania Meta-analysis Blinding Study Group. Does blinding of readers affect the results of meta-analyses? *Lancet*. 1997; 350: 185-86.
2. Buscemi N, Hartling L, Vandermeer B, Tjosvold L, Klassen TP. Single data extraction generated more errors than double data extraction in systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2006 Jul;59(7):697-703. Epub 2006 Mar 15. PubMed PMID: 16765272.
3. Morissette K, Tricco AC, Horsley T, Chen MH, Moher D. Blinded versus unblinded assessments of risk of bias in studies included in a systematic review. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2011, Issue 9. Art. No.: MR000025. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.MR000025.pub2.
4. Aytug ZG, Rothstein HR, Zhou W, and Kern MC. Revealed or concealed? Transparency of procedures, decisions, and judgment calls in meta-analyses. 2012. *Organizational Research Methods*, 15(1), 103-133.

Qualitative synthesis and interpreting results

1. Li T, Vedula SS, Hadar N, Parkin C, Lau J, Dickersin K. Innovations in data collection, management, and archiving for systematic reviews. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2015; 162(4):287-94.

Planning meta-analysis

1. Glass, G. Primary, secondary, and meta-analysis of research. *Educational Researcher*. 1976. 3-8.
2. Deeks JJ. Issues in the selection of a summary statistic for meta-analysis of clinical trials with binary outcomes. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2002; 21: 1575-1600.
3. Borenstein M, Hedges LV, Higgins JP, and Rothstein HR. *Introduction to meta-analysis*. John Wiley & Sons. 2011

Statistical methods for meta-analysis

1. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*. 1986; 7: 177-88.

2. Thompson SG, Higgins JPT. Can meta-analysis help target interventions at individuals most likely to benefit? *Lancet*. 2005; 365: 341-46.

Identifying and quantifying heterogeneity

1. DerSimonian R, Laird N. Meta-analysis in clinical trials. *Controlled Clinical Trials*. 1986; 7: 177-88.
2. Thompson SG, Higgins JPT. Can meta-analysis help target interventions at individuals most likely to benefit? *Lancet*. 2005; 365: 341-46.

Meta-analysis of observational data

1. Shrier I, Boivin JF, Steele RJ, et al. Should meta-analyses of interventions include observational studies in addition to randomized controlled trials? A critical examination of underlying principles. *American Journal of Epidemiology* 2007;166:1203–1209
2. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al., for the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) Group. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology. A proposal for reporting. *JAMA*. 2000; 283: 2008-12.

Additional topics in meta-analysis: Meta-regression; subgroup analysis; sensitivity analysis

1. Greenland S, Longnecker MP. Methods for trend estimation from summarized dose-response data, with applications to meta-analysis. *American Journal of Epidemiology*. 1992; 135: 1301-09.
2. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG. Controlling the risk of spurious findings from meta-regression. *Statistics in Medicine*. 2004; 23: 1663-82.

Network meta-analysis methods in addressing comparative effectiveness research questions

1. Li T, Puhan M, Vedula SS, Singh S, Dickersin K for the Ad Hoc Network Meta-analysis Methods Meeting Working Group. Network meta-analysis – highly attractive and more methodological research is needed. *BMC Medicine*. 2011;9(1):79.
2. Li T, Lindsley K, Rouse B, Hong H, Shi Q, Friedman DS, Wormald R, Dickersin K. Comparative effectiveness of first-line medications for primary open angle glaucoma – a systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Ophthalmology*. 2015. pii: S0161-6420(15)00979-3. doi: 10.1016/j.ophtha.2015.09.005. [Epub ahead of print]
3. Rouse B, Cipriani A, Shi Q, Coleman AL, Dickersin K, Li T. Network meta-analysis for clinical practice guidelines – a case study on first-line medical therapies for primary open-angle glaucoma. *Annals of Internal Medicine*. 2016 (In press).

Readings Related to Reporting of Systematic Reviews

1. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG; PRISMA Group. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med*. 2009; 6(7):e1000097. Epub 2009 Jul 21.
2. Drazen JM, Van der Weyden MB, Sahni P, et al. Uniform format for disclosure of competing interests in ICMJE journals. *JAMA*. 2010 Jan 6; 303(1):75-6.

3. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al., for the Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) Group. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology. A proposal for reporting. *JAMA*. 2000; 283: 2008-12.
4. Plint AC, Moher D, Morrison A, et al. Does the CONSORT checklist improve the quality of reports of randomized controlled trials? A systematic review. *MJA*. 2006; 185: 263-67.
5. Bossuyt PM, Reitsma JB, Bruns DE, et al. The STARD statement for reporting studies of diagnostic accuracy: explanation and elaboration. *Clinical Chemistry* January 2003 vol. 49 no. 1 7-18. doi: 10.1373/49.1.7