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Hardin Library for the Health Sciences, University of Iowa
Four librarians have been trained through the University of Pittsburgh program

Three librarians have taken part in systematic reviews
- 28 searches completed
- 9 searches had librarian assistance with strategies and database selection
- 9 searches in progress now

Co-author on 28 papers, although not all have yet been published

But – no formalized program!
THE ISSUE

- Systematic reviews are a major topic of interest.
- An increasing number of job ads include systematic review skills.
- Librarians at Hardin Library have been performing them as needed.

OUR SOLUTION

- Librarians at Hardin Library decided to survey colleagues about the systematic review programs. This paper describes the data gathered.
- The data will inform the development of Hardin Library’s formal program.
- A survey was sent through several venues: Midwest Chapter, Expert Searching listserv, Medlib-L, AAHSL, Facebook.
SURVEY RESPONDENTS

- 293 responses received
- 146 responses listed institution name (130 after removing duplicates)
- 65 AAHSL Libraries responded
- 120 US/Canada and 10 non-US libraries

TYPES OF LIBRARIES

- Academic: 69%
- Hospital: 15%
- Government Organizations: 6%
- Corporate: 1%
- Organizations: 5%
- Academic/hospital: 2%
- Undefined: 2%
Do you or the librarians at your institution participate in systematic reviews?

Yes: [VALUE] (75%)
No: [VALUE] (14%)
Not yet: [VALUE] (12%)
HOW MANY LIBRARIANS PARTICIPATE?

52.2% of survey respondents answered this question (153/293)
WHAT IS THE LEVEL OF THEIR INVOLVEMENT?

- **Full provision of services**: 19%
- **Highly involved**: 30%
- **Needs based/variable**: 28%
- **Primarily consultative**: 6%
- **Unclear, unsure, just starting**: 16%
- **Other**: 1%
### FULL PROVISION OF SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol development, search strategy development, citation management, screening administration, methodology documentation, manuscript preparation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Develop search strategy, search appropriate databases, help review articles, write methods section of paper, provide training, included on grants, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning, implementation, searching, screening, some analysis, article-writing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Search strategy review and critique, full search strategy development, co-authorship and writing methods sections</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“Developing the search strategy and exporting results”

“Delivering all items necessary for the writing of the methods section”

“Keyword identification, search strategy development, hedges/filters”

“Mostly searching; one librarian has been included on a grant.”
PRIMARILY CONSULTATIVE

| ...advising on recording results, setting up alerts, saving searches. All done in collaboration with the investigators - not done as a service for them |
| Support the process with a libguide, consultations, review of search strategies |
| I train learners (students and residents, mainly) to conduct thorough searches for their systematic review projects. |
| Getting people started; suggesting sources; helping with citation management |
“Depending upon the team and/project, the level of involvement varies”

“Librarians have participated in every phase of systematic reviews from formulating search strategies to reading, reviewing and synthesizing content to contributing to the writing of a systematic review. Typically, the level of involvement is negotiated”

“We promote the service, educate users about what constitutes an SR, run the searches, and if asked, participate in writing the methods sections”

“Involvement varies with the user. Most cases we consult with user, design strategies, test, set up auto-alerts, write appendix portion of paper with strategy. Further involvement may include downloading references to EN & eliminating duplicates.”
UNCLEAR, UNSURE, OR JUST STARTING

“We are just starting. I have done a few background searches but have not taken the process from beginning to end.”

“Involved with nursing issues requiring literature searches, and systematic review of the results.”

“Don’t know. I do all mine myself and I’m an MD faculty member.”

“Involvement is a tricky word. Typically, I’m only told to conduct a literature review on a broad subject category and left to do it however I see fit.”

“Support staff to carry these out by providing literature search training and doing searches as well.”

“When requested, we do them”
CURRENT LEVELS OF INVOLVEMENT AT HARDIN

- Without co-authorship status
  - Assist with question development
  - Review/assist with database selection and search strategies
- With co-authorship status
  - Librarians are fully involved throughout the process
  - One librarian has been included in funding from the CDC for an extensive project
Assistance with refining PICOS questions
Assisting with the development of protocols for Prospero
Designing and running all searches
Importing and deduping citations using EndNote
Assisting with location of full text articles
Creating a PRISMA flow-chart for results found
Writing search methods for publication
Reviewing article/presentation drafts
Are the librarians at your institution listed as co-authors on presentations, posters, and/or publications?

- Always: [VALUE] (68%)
- Sometimes: [VALUE] (16%)
- Never: [VALUE] (10%)
- Unsure: [VALUE] (6%)

0 20 40 60 80 100 120
Always Sometimes Never Unsure
WHY AREN’T LIBRARIANS LISTED AS CO-AUTHORS?

- Librarian input is not recognized
  - researchers do not realize the amount of work librarians put into systematic reviews
  - work was not significant enough (mentioned 4 times)
  - library services were generally deemed unimportant (mentioned 2 times)
  - researchers are not used to the idea of including librarians

- Librarians are listed in acknowledgements rather than as authors (mentioned 2 times)

- One librarian is “too modest” to ask

- One mentioned they charged for the service and therefore could not be listed as authors.

- Three indicated they were not involved in writing the manuscripts.
  - One indicated this was based on ICMJE standards, while others cited the ICMJE standards as the reason librarians were asked to co-author!
ICMJE AUTHORSHIP STANDARDS

- The ICMJE recommends that authorship be based on the following 4 criteria:
  - Substantial contributions to the conception or design of the work; or the acquisition, analysis, or interpretation of data for the work; AND
  - Drafting the work or revising it critically for important intellectual content; AND
  - Final approval of the version to be published; AND
  - Agreement to be accountable for all aspects of the work in ensuring that questions related to the accuracy or integrity of any part of the work are appropriately investigated and resolved.

CO-AUTHORSHIP AT HARDIN

- Authors are very receptive to including librarians as authors
  - Librarians have been offered co-authorship on 28 reviews
- One librarian was offered first-authorship, which she declined
- One librarian was also listed on a publication that was submitted before the search was completed!
DO YOU HAVE A PUBLIC WEB PAGE DESCRIBING SYSTEMATIC REVIEWS IN GENERAL?

- Yes: [VALUE] (29%)
- No: [VALUE] (38%)
- Not yet: [VALUE] (33%)
DO YOU HAVE A PUBLIC WEBPAGE WITH DETAILS ABOUT YOUR SYSTEMATIC REVIEW SERVICES?

Yes: [VALUE] (32%)  
No: [VALUE] (37%)  
Not yet: [VALUE] (30%)
ARE YOU MARKETING SYSTEMATIC REVIEW SERVICES IN OTHER WAYS?

Yes: [VALUE] (47%)

No: [VALUE] (53%)
MARKETING STRATEGIES

- Presentations: 25%
- Classes: 14%
- Library website/blog: 11%
- Other liaison activities: 12%
- Signs: 3%
- Mailings: 7%
- Other: 8%
- Library brochures or newsletters: 11%
- Word of mouth: 9%
- Other liaison activities: 12%
Which departments seem to be using your service the most?
ARE YOU CHARGING AFFILIATED USERS?

Yes: [VALUE] (12%)
No: [VALUE] (88%)
ARE YOU CHARGING AFFILIATED USERS?

- Per hour charges ($10 to $75 per hour)
- The cost of articles ordered from the search, with a cap of $30 per article.
- The actual cost of librarian time plus any cost incurred searching databases through services like Dialog, which charge per minute and/or citation.
- Unspecified flat rates for the project.
ARE YOU PROVIDING SYSTEMATIC REVIEW SERVICES FOR NON-AFFILIATED RESEARCHERS?

[VALUE] (18%) Yes

[VALUE] (82%) No
ARE YOU CHARGING FEES UNAFFILIATED RESEARCHERS?

17 of the 25 charge unaffiliated users.

Examples in dollars began at $50 per hour.

Other examples were

- $100 per hour, with a minimum of 10 hours
- 800 Swedish Krona per hour (about $112 per hour)
- 100 Euros ($127) per hour
- 100 Euros ($127) per review

Fees were reported in dollars, pounds, Euros, and Swedish Krona!
DO YOU HAVE AN INTERNAL PROCESS TO TRACK PROJECTS AND ASSIGN NEW REQUESTS?

Yes (46%)  No (54%)
HOW DO YOU ENSURE THAT LIBRARIANS DEVELOP AND MAINTAIN EXPERTISE IN SYSTEMATIC REVIEW SEARCHING?

In-person Workshops: [VALUE] (81%)
CE Courses through conferences: [VALUE] (74%)
Other: [VALUE] (48%)
OTHER METHODS

- Consulting the Literature: 23%
- Webinars/Online Tutorials/CE Courses via the Web: 33%
- Librarian Meetings & Information Discussions: 14%
- Consulting Listservs: 5%
- Peer to Peer Training: 12%
- Working on Research Projects: 4%
- Committee Membership: 2%
- Prior Professional Experience: 7%
CONCERNS AND IMPLICATIONS

- Time commitments and constraints must be understood.
- Levels of commitment must be spelled out in our program, to insure that all users are offered the same level of service.
- Expectations on both sides of the process must be understood.
  - Student vs faculty requests
- Concern about providing continued support when researchers leave before the systematic review is published must be addressed.
- We will probably continue our “non-marketing” strategy.
CONCLUSIONS

- Although many libraries are offering a systematic review service without a formalized program, we feel we need to formalize ours.

- We plan on conducting a follow up study on more specific aspect of systematic reviews with colleagues at another institution.
THANK YOU!

Questions?