



eunethta

EUROPEAN NETWORK FOR HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT

GUIDELINE

Process of information retrieval for systematic reviews and health technology assessments on clinical effectiveness

Version 1.1, December 2016

The primary objective of EUnetHTA scientific guidance is to focus on methodological challenges that are encountered by HTA assessors while performing relative effectiveness assessments of pharmaceuticals or non-pharmaceutical health technologies.

As such the guideline represents a consolidated view of non-binding recommendations of EUnetHTA network members and in no case an official opinion of the participating institutions or individuals.

Version	Description of changes	Funding	Date of publication
1.0	First Version	EUnetHTA JA2 WP7	July 2015
1.1	Editorial changes and minor updates based on recently published literature. The meaning of recommendations was not altered.	EUnetHTA JA3 WP6	December 2016

European network for Health Technology Assessment | www.eunetha.eu

This methodological guideline on “Process of information retrieval for systematic reviews and health technology assessments on clinical effectiveness” has been developed by the Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care (IQWiG) / Germany

Contact person: Elke Hausner (elke.hausner@iqwig.de)

The version 1.0 of this guideline was reviewed by a group of dedicated reviewers from:

- National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) / United Kingdom
- State Health Care Accreditation Agency (VASPVT) / Lithuania

The version 1.1 of this guideline was reviewed by a draft group with members from:

- Norwegian Institute of Public Health (NIPHNO) / Norway
- Andalusian Agency for Health Technology Assessment (AETSA) / Spain

Table of contents

Acronyms - Abbreviations	5
Summary and table with main recommendations	6
1. Introduction.....	8
1.1. Definitions of central terms and concepts.....	8
1.2. Objective(s) and scope of the guideline (problem statement).....	11
1.3. Related EUnetHTA documents	13
2. Analysis and discussion of the methodological issue	14
2.1. Methods of information retrieval for guideline development	14
2.2. General issues	14
2.3. Bibliographic databases	16
2.4. Study registries.....	23
2.5. Searching for unpublished company documents.....	27
2.6. Further information sources and techniques	28
3. Conclusion and main recommendations.....	32
Annexe 1. Bibliography	33
Annexe 2. Documentation of the literature search	48
Annexe 3. Common reporting elements.....	51
Annexe 4. Example: Ultrasound screening for abdominal aortic aneurysms	52

Acronyms - Abbreviations

AHRQ – Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality

AMSTAR – A Measurement Tool to Assess Systematic Reviews

CRD – Centre for Reviews and Dissemination

CSR – Clinical Study Report

EMA – European Medicines Agency

EU-CTR – EU Clinical Trials Register

FDA – Food and Drug Administration

HTA – Health Technology Assessment

IFPMA – International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers & Associations

ICTRP – International Clinical Trials Registry Platform

IQWiG – Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care

MeSH – Medical Subject Headings

NICE – National Institute for Health and Care Excellence

NLM – National Library of Medicine

PICOS – Patient or Population / Intervention / Comparison / Outcome / Study design

PRISMA – Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses

PRESS Checklist – Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies Checklist

RCT – Randomized Controlled Trial

RMS – Reference management software

SuRe Info – Summarized Research in Information Retrieval for HTA

SR – Systematic Review

Summary and table with main recommendations

Problem statement

Systematic reviews and Health Technology Assessments (HTAs) on clinical effectiveness aim to support evidence-based decision-making in health care. Information retrieval for systematic reviews needs to be performed in a systematic, transparent and reproducible manner.

The aim of this methodological guideline is to provide an up-to-date and transparent overview of the whole information retrieval process. The methods described refer to searches for randomized controlled trials (RCTs), but can largely also be applied to searches for other study designs.

In particular, the requirements presented in this methodological guideline aim to provide orientation for systematic searches on clinical effectiveness conducted within the framework of EUnetHTA.

Methods

The guideline authors screened methods manuals of various organizations to identify the relevant literature. In addition, we used the internal IQWiG database, which contains the literature identified by IQWiG's regular searches for articles on information retrieval. We also performed various search techniques to identify further relevant publications.

The guideline was primarily based on empirical evidence. If this was not available, the experiences of the guideline authors and other information specialists were considered.

The relevant sections of the literature used for the guideline were screened by one author and extracted. A second author performed quality assurance by checking the extracted text and its suitability for the guideline.

Recommendations	The recommendation is based on arguments presented in the following publications and / or parts of the guideline text
1 st recommendation: Information specialists should form an integral part of the project team of a systematic review from the beginning of the project.	2.2.1
2 nd recommendation: A systematic review should regularly include a search for unpublished literature to identify both unpublished studies and unpublished data from published studies.	2.2.2, 3
3 rd recommendation: Besides MEDLINE, other bibliographic databases such as Embase and CENTRAL should be searched to identify all published relevant studies on the topic of interest.	2.3.4

4 th recommendation: Individual search strategies must be developed for selected databases using both free-text terms and, if available, subject headings.	2.3.5
5 th recommendation: Search strategies should undergo peer reviewing to ensure high-quality search strategies.	2.3.6, 2.4.5
6 th recommendation: The search process should be documented in real time and reported in a transparent manner.	2.3.9, 2.4.8

1. Introduction

1.1. Definitions of central terms and concepts

1.1.1. Search interface

Bibliographic databases can often be accessed via different search interfaces. For example, MEDLINE is freely accessible via PubMed, which is provided by the National Library of Medicine (NLM). However, MEDLINE is also searchable via the fee-based interface OvidSP or ProQuest. These interfaces differ with regard to structure and functionalities, but contain nearly the same data pool.

Study registries are generally searched via the interface offered by the registry provider. The meta-registry ICTRP Search Portal publishes the data pool provided by different registries in a common database.

1.1.2. PubMed Segments

PubMed consists of various segments (subsets) and users can limit a search to a particular segment. Only the MEDLINE segment has been indexed with MeSH terms and has undergone a quality control procedure.

Extract from [1]:

Status Tag	Citation Status
PubMed - as supplied by publisher	Citations recently added to PubMed via electronic submission from a publisher, and are soon to proceed to the next stage, PubMed - in process (see below). This tag is also on citations received before late 2003 if they are from journals not indexed for MEDLINE, or from a journal that was accepted for MEDLINE after the citations' publication date. These citations bibliographic data have not been reviewed.
PubMed - in process	Citations bibliographic data will be reviewed and indexed, i.e., MeSH terms will be assigned (if the subject of the article is within the scope of MEDLINE).
PubMed - indexed for MEDLINE	Citations that have been indexed with MeSH terms, Publication Types, Substance Names, etc. and bibliographic data have been reviewed.
PubMed	Citations that have been reviewed for accurate bibliographic data but will not receive MEDLINE indexing, because they are for articles in non-MEDLINE journals, or they are for articles in MEDLINE journals but the articles are out of scope or they are from issues published prior to the date the journal was selected for indexing, or citations to articles from journals that deposit their full text articles in PMC but have not yet been recommended for indexing in MEDLINE.

1.1.3. Search terms

Search terms: All terms used in a search, i.e. subject headings and free-text terms (see below).

Free-text terms (so-called text words): Terms included in the title and abstract of a publication in a bibliographic database, or in the title and other fields of an entry in a study registry.

Subject headings: Controlled vocabulary used by bibliographic databases to describe the content of a publication. Most of the major databases have their own controlled vocabulary. Medical Subject Headings (MeSH) are the controlled vocabulary indexing system developed by the NLM for indexing publications in MEDLINE. MeSH is also used in other databases (e.g. CENTRAL). Emtree thesaurus is used in Embase. Subheadings: Qualifiers that can be used in conjunction with subject headings to limit them to a particular aspect or as a stand alone to extend a search strategy.

Search string: An individual search query.

Search strategy: The combination of the individual search terms and strings used in a search.

1.1.4. Search filters

A predefined combination of search terms developed to filter references with a specific content. They often consist of a combination of subject headings, free-text terms and publication types, and are used to limit searches to specific study designs (e.g. RCTs), populations (e.g. elderly patients) or topics (e.g. adverse events). High-quality filters should be validated using an independent set of relevant references. They are often developed with different characteristics, for example, maximized sensitivity ("broad"), maximized specificity ("narrow"), and optimized search filters ("minimizing difference").

1.1.5. Search functions

It should be noted that search functions differ depending on the source and the search interface.

Boolean operators: Define the type of relation between two search terms. The most usual are:

- "AND": Both search terms must be included in the search result.
- "OR": At least one of the terms needs to be included in the search result.
- "NOT": Any search term placed after this operator should not be included in the result.

Proximity or adjacency operator: Two search terms have a specified distance between each other independent of the word order. For example "skin adj3 infection" in Ovid identifies phrases such as "skin infection" or "infection of the skin". Adj3 means there can be a maximum of only two words between the words "skin" and "infection".

Truncation: Can be used to search for variant forms of words (e.g. vaccin* identifies words such as vaccination, vaccine and vaccines). Different interfaces use different truncation marks. Some interfaces allow truncation at the beginning or in the middle of the word, using a function known as wildcard; some interfaces only allow to search for a certain number of variations of the truncated word (e.g. truncation in PubMed is restricted to 600 variations).

“Explode” function: Automatically combines the subject heading via OR with all related narrower subject headings.

Focus: Limits the search to those publications where a specific subject heading is classified as a “major topic”.

Search fields: Fields of records in which the search is conducted. These usually need to be defined for the search strings (e.g. with the abbreviation [tiab] for a search in titles and abstracts via PubMed).

Search syntax: The rules about how search terms and search functions (such as operators or search fields) are spelled, combined and arranged (depends on the search functions of the database).

1.1.6. Surveillance search techniques

Snowballing: Search technique for identifying further relevant articles by means of a known relevant article. This can be achieved by screening the reference list of a known article (backward citations) or by checking which other articles have cited the relevant article (forward citations). The main citation tracking systems providing this “cited-by” service are Google Scholar, Web of Science, and Scopus.

Pearl growing: Search terms and subject headings of one relevant article are examined and form the search strategy. Further relevant articles will be identified with this search strategy. The articles are used to examine more search terms and subject headings to extend the search strategy. This approach can be repeated until no further relevant search terms and subject headings are identified.

“Similar articles” function: Identifies similar articles to a selected article using an algorithm calculated by means of the frequencies of subject headings and free-text terms in titles and abstracts.

1.1.7. Limits

Filters integrated in the search interface of a database that can be used to limit the search results to, for example, specific publication years and languages. Limits can vary depending on the interface or the database.

1.1.8. Statistical measures

In the field of information retrieval, the sensitivity (recall) for a given topic is defined as the proportion of relevant documents for the topic that were retrieved. Precision is the proportion of retrieved documents that were relevant.

Sensitivity and precision are inversely interrelated, meaning an increase in sensitivity normally goes along with a decrease in precision. In order to know the true sensitivity, a gold standard must be predefined, for example, by hand searching or relative recall of included studies from multiple systematic reviews.

1.1.9. Accession number

An accession number is a specific (mostly multi-digit) unique identification number for a reference in a bibliographic database or an entry in a study registry. In MEDLINE these numbers are referred to as “PubMed identifiers” (e.g. PMID: 19230612). A reference included in several databases has several different accession numbers.

1.1.10. Auto alert

The search interfaces of bibliographic databases often provide the option to save search strategies. The auto-alert function allows the automatic repetition of the saved strategies at specified intervals (e.g. once monthly). If new references are identified, users receive an e-mail.

1.1.11. Bias

“A bias is a systematic error, or deviation from the truth, in results or inferences. Biases can operate in either direction: different biases can lead to underestimation or overestimation of the true intervention effect [2]”. Different types of bias exist in clinical research, for example, selection, performance, detection, attrition, and reporting bias (a detailed overview is provided in the Cochrane Handbook [2]).

1.2. Objective(s) and scope of the guideline (problem statement)

Systematic reviews and Health Technology Assessments (HTAs) on clinical effectiveness aim to support evidence-based decision-making in health care. (This guideline applies to both types of reports. For reasons of simplicity, “systematic reviews and HTAs” is abbreviated to “systematic reviews”.)

Information retrieval for systematic reviews needs to be performed in a thorough, transparent and reproducible manner. The aim is to identify all relevant studies and study results on the question of interest (within resource limits) [3]. This requires both searches in several information sources and the use of comprehensive search strategies [3-5]. This approach is a key factor in minimizing bias in the review process [5].

The aim of this methodological guideline is to provide an up-to-date and transparent overview of the whole information retrieval process. The methods described refer to searches for randomized controlled trials (RCTs), but can largely also be applied to searches for other study designs.

In particular, the requirements presented in this methodological guideline aim to provide orientation for systematic searches on clinical effectiveness conducted within the framework of EUnetHTA.

Aspects of the guideline

Bibliographic databases are the main sources for information retrieval in systematic reviews on clinical effectiveness. However, study registries and study results registries have become more important to identify ongoing and unpublished studies. (In the following text, the term “study registries” will be used for both types of registries.)

Since preliminary searches for systematic reviews are an important part of the information retrieval process, special focus will be placed on how to perform these searches. Different approaches will be described, including the use of special search techniques to identify primary studies [6,7].

Besides the conceptual approach for identifying search terms [3], more objective approaches will also be presented [7,8]. The latter are increasingly important approaches in information retrieval for systematic reviews [9]. The use of search filters for RCTs and other limits, peer review of search strategies [7,10-12], reference management (including

different software programs), as well as issues around the documentation and reporting of search strategies [13,14], will be described in detail.

The technical process of screening titles, abstracts and selected full texts (e.g. using a web-based trial selection database [15]) will be a further component of the guideline.

Further information sources

Further information sources, such as reference lists of publications (primarily systematic reviews) [16], conference abstracts [17], queries to authors [18], regulatory documents [19,20], and unpublished company documents [21] will also be described.

Excluded aspects

The description of searches for studies on specific aspects such as safety, diagnostic accuracy, and economic evaluations (for HTAs) will not form part of this guideline. Summarized Research in Information Retrieval for HTA (SuRe Info) provides research-based evidence on methods to use when searching for these specific aspects [22].

The description of the technical screening process will not contain the process of study selection by means of inclusion and exclusion criteria.

1.3. Related EUnetHTA documents

No EUnetHTA document is exclusively dedicated to HTA information retrieval. Several internal guidance documents contain sections with recommendations on how to conduct information searches in the context of the given activity or product. These sections are on different levels of detail. They provide context-specific advice, which can be useful in addition to the recommendations given in this methodological guideline which is focusing on clinical effectiveness assessment. Some of these EUnetHTA documents are expected to be updated during JA 2. The identified documents are

- EUnetHTA WP5 Joint Action 2: HTA Core Model® for Rapid Relative Effectiveness Assessment of Pharmaceuticals version 3.0 (01.03.2013), Appendix 3. “Systematic review of the literature”, p. 63 – 68
- EUnetHTA WP5 Joint Action 2: Procedure Manual WP5 Strand B: Rapid assessments of other health technologies such as medical devices, surgical interventions or diagnostics, V3 (29.04.2013), Chapter 2.3 “Sources of information for the assessment”, p. 15 – 17
- EUnetHTA Joint Action 2 WP4: Methodological Standards and Procedures (MSP) for core HTA content development (2013), V1.1, General issues: carrying out evidence searches, p. 48 – 50
- HTA Core Model handbook (version 2.1, pp.29 ff)

2. Analysis and discussion of the methodological issue

2.1. Methods of information retrieval for guideline development

The following literature was used in the development of the guideline:

- Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (AHRQ) Methods Guide for Comparative Effectiveness Reviews [4]
- Centre for Reviews and Disseminations (CRD's) Guidance for Undertaking Reviews in Health Care [5]
- Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions [23]
- Methodological Standards for the Conduct of New Cochrane Intervention Reviews [24]
- Institute of Medicine's Standards for Systematic Reviews [25]
- AHRQ Methods for Effective Health Care [26] (for unpublished literature)
- PRESS: Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies [10,27] (for bibliographic databases)

In addition, we used the internal IQWiG database, which contains the literature identified by IQWiG's regular searches for articles on information retrieval. This database contains, among other things, the results of an ongoing systematic literature search for topics related to information retrieval, which started in 2008 (see Annexe 2 for details). The list of citations can be provided on request.

Furthermore, the guideline authors performed various search techniques, such as snowballing, PubMed's related citation search, and simple searches (see Annexe 2) to identify further relevant publications.

The guideline was primarily based on empirical evidence published after the year 2000. If this was not available, the experiences of the guideline authors and other information specialists were considered.

The relevant sections of the literature used for the guideline were screened by one author and extracted into Excel. A second author performed quality assurance by checking the extracted text and its suitability for the guideline.

2.2. General issues

2.2.1. Expertise in searching

Information specialists should form an integral part of the project team of a systematic review from the beginning of the project [5,25]. Search strategy development requires expertise and skills in search methodology [9]. Navigating through different information sources is a complex task [25], especially as the structure and functionalities of the databases and their interfaces are continually modified.

The tasks of information specialists are manifold [3,28-30]. They are responsible for the development and peer review of search strategies, as well as the actual conduct of the search [11,25,31]. In addition, they commonly deal with methodological challenges (e.g. how to balance sensitivity and precision in the development of a search strategy [4]), draft

or write the search methods section of the review [32,33], and are responsible for the implementation of software solutions in information management [33].

The call for the routine involvement of information specialists in systematic reviews is supported by research findings: Firstly, their involvement significantly increases the use of recommended search methods [34]. Secondly, search strategies developed and reported by information specialists are easier to reproduce [35,36] and contain fewer consequential errors [37].

2.2.2. Addressing reporting bias (including publication bias)

Searches in bibliographic databases aim primarily to identify published studies (see Section 2.3). However, much research is never published or is published with delay [38-41], and published studies tend to overestimate the effectiveness of interventions and underestimate harms [40,41].

To reduce publication and outcome reporting bias, a systematic review should regularly include a search for unpublished literature to identify both unpublished studies and unpublished data from published studies (see Sections 2.4, 2.5 and 2.6).

In this context it should be noted that only clinical study reports provide (almost) complete information on a study [42], whereas the information provided in study registries and journal publications is often insufficient for the assessment of a study. However, registries and publications may supplement each other [21] or registries can be used to verify published data [26].

Various analyses have shown inconsistencies between the information provided in study registries and that in journal publications (e.g. regarding inclusion criteria, endpoints investigated or rates of adverse events [21,43-48]). This may lead to differing assessments of the same study. Despite the importance of unpublished data, HTA agencies do not routinely search study registries or send enquiries to companies [49].

2.3. Bibliographic databases

2.3.1. Process of searching bibliographic databases

The figure shows the process of searching bibliographic databases (Figure 1). The steps will be explained in the following sections in detail. In addition, a practical example can be found in the Annexe 4.




Figure 1: Search in bibliographic databases

Copyright © EUnetHTA 2016. All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced without an explicit acknowledgement of the source and EUnetHTA's expressed consent

2.3.2. Conducting preliminary searches

At the start of a project – before the development of the actual search strategy – a preliminary search (also known as a scoping search) should be conducted. This preliminary search has various goals.

Firstly, to help prepare the overall project [32], i.e. understanding the key questions [4], identifying existing systematic reviews [5,50,51], identifying a first set of potentially relevant primary studies [52], and estimating the resources necessary to perform the systematic review [50]. Secondly, the results of the preliminary search can be used in the development of the search strategy, for instance, by generating a list of search terms from the analysis of identified relevant articles [4,53-55] and subsequently used in the development of the search strategy.

Two main methods for conducting preliminary searches are described in the literature. With the first method, systematic reviews on the topic of interest are systematically searched for in preselected information sources [5,50,51,56] such as the Cochrane Library, CRD databases and, if meaningful the websites of HTA agencies (e.g. NICE and AHRQ). In order to identify ongoing HTA reports and systematic reviews, further sources should be considered (e.g. the POP database [57] and PROSPERO [58]).

The second method comprises an iterative process with different search techniques such as “snowballing” (backward or forward citations) [4,55,59] and checking the “similar articles” link in PubMed [6,60,61] (see 2.6.3). The starting point is a relevant article either already known or identified by a very precise search. Several cycles of reference identification with these techniques and screening for relevance are then performed [4,55].

The most effective way of conducting a preliminary search is first to search for systematic reviews. The techniques described above (e.g. “snowballing”) are used to search directly for primary studies if the first search produced no relevant or only poor-quality reviews [55].

See example: Conducting preliminary searches (bib. Databases)

2.3.3. Structuring the search strategy

Before the development of a search strategy, the structure of the search has to be defined. This requires a clearly formulated research question following the Patient or Population / Intervention / Comparison / Outcome / Study design (PICOS) approach [3]. The research question is commonly broken into concepts, and only the most important ones are used to develop the search strategy [62]. The main challenge is not to introduce too many concepts [3,10], as many may not be adequately addressed in the title, abstract, and subject headings of the articles [4].

In general, a search strategy may include the population, intervention(s), and types of study design [3]. Outcome is usually not included in a systematic search. For more complex review questions, it may be necessary to use several combinations of search concepts to capture a review topic [9,63] or to use other search approaches to capture relevant studies (see section 2.3.2).

The search terms are allocated to the individual search concepts or facets, according to the structure of the search. Within each concept, the relevant subject headings and free-text terms are combined with the Boolean operator “OR” [3]. In this context, the use of separate lines for subject headings and free-text terms facilitates the quality assurance of search strategies since it enhances the readability of search strategies and therefore helps to avoid errors.

Validated study filters are used for the search concepts on study design (see Section 2.3.5.1). All search concepts are then combined with the “AND” operator [3].

If search strategies are limited, for example, by language or publication year, this should be justified in the methods section of the systematic review. However, such limits should be used with caution, as they may introduce bias [3,4,10]. Moreover, they should only be considered if they can be reliably applied in the individual databases.

See example: Structuring the search strategy (bib. Databases)

2.3.4. Choosing information sources

The production of a systematic review requires a systematic search in several bibliographic databases. For example, previous research has shown that searching MEDLINE alone is insufficient to identify all published relevant studies on the topic of interest and may produce biased results [64-67]. This is due to the fact that journal inclusion rates differ between databases [68,69]. Furthermore, the time and quality of indexing differs [65,69-71], meaning that a reference might be more difficult to find or be found with delay in some databases, but not in others.

However, insufficient empirical evidence is available so far on how many and which databases should be regularly searched. The Cochrane Handbook names MEDLINE, Embase and CENTRAL as the three most important bibliographic databases (for primary studies) [3]. Analyses of retrieval rates of relevant studies indicate that most of the published studies can be found in these sources [66,72,73].

Depending on the objective of the systematic review, regional or subject-specific databases may also be relevant [3-5,25,74]. However, the additional impact of searching in regional databases has been insufficiently investigated, and many of such databases seem to provide restricted functionalities [75,76]. In contrast, at least for some objectives the use of subject-specific databases may identify additional relevant studies (e.g. on complementary and alternative medicine) [77,78]. A list of regional and subject-specific databases is provided in the Cochrane Handbook [3].

See example: Choosing information sources (bib. Databases)

2.3.5. Developing search strategies

2.3.5.1. Identifying search terms

A combination of subject headings (including publication type) and free-text terms is required in the development of search strategies [79-81]. Different approaches to identify search terms are described in the literature [7,82]. The traditional or conceptual approach

[83,84] is recommended by the pertinent literature. Sources used in this approach include the MeSH database, medical dictionaries, scanning of relevant publications or consultations with experts to identify a wide range of subject headings and free-text terms [3,5,52]. In addition, one or more key articles are commonly chosen as a starting point to identify further relevant terms using methods such as “pearl growing” [62]. This process is usually repeated until no further relevant material is found [85].

More objective approaches to develop a search strategy use text-analytic procedures to identify free-text terms and subject headings through a frequency analysis [86]. In this context relevant articles already known [7,8,87,88] or newly identified through broad searches [85,89] are systematically analysed. Different software packages are available that in part clearly differ with regard to costs and functionalities (e.g. PubReMiner [7], Wordstat [89,90], TerMine [91], EndNote [92], Text Mining Package of R [8], AntConc [93] and Leximancer [85]).

In the next step the terms chosen are assigned to the individual concepts of the search strategy, independently of which approach was chosen to identify subject headings and free-text terms [10,62]. To avoid redundancies, free-text terms should be truncated at the word stem [94] and subject headings and related subordinate subject headings should be summarized with the “explode” function [3,10], if meaningful. The inclusion of further search fields (e.g. substance name, original title), as well as the restriction of subject headings via subheadings or focus (for topic-specific results) must be checked separately for each research question.

Terms related to topic or study design need not be identified if well-tested, high-quality filters for study design are available [4]. Study filters and topic-based filters are provided by the InterTASC Information Specialists' Sub-Group [95] and can be evaluated before the search using critical appraisal checklists [96,97]. The Cochrane Handbook [3] and the Health Information Research Unit of McMaster university [98] provide high-quality filters for RCTs.

RCTs of drugs can be identified with a simple standardized search using the truncated generic drug name in all search fields; this achieves a sensitivity of more than 99% in MEDLINE or Embase [99].

The search for references not yet indexed in PubMed is a major challenge. For this purpose, free-text terms and study filters may need to be adapted [100,101] as searches are usually optimized for a combined subject headings and free-text search.

See example: Identifying search terms (bib. Databases)

2.3.5.2. Adapting the search syntax

After the structure of the search, the search terms and the databases have been determined, the actual strategy can be developed. Instead of using cross-database search options, each database should be searched individually [33]. For this purpose, the free-text terms previously identified can usually be applied across databases [5].

Subject headings must be specifically adapted for each database [3-5,10,102]. In this context it is advisable to adapt the search strategy developed first (commonly in MEDLINE [28]) to the requirements of the other databases [3,4,10,102]. It should also be noted that

certain features are implemented differently by the interfaces of the various databases (e.g. truncation, proximity operators, and the “explode function”). Uniform application of the search syntax is thus not possible and may produce inconsistent search results [94,103].

See example: Adapting the search syntax (bib. Databases)

2.3.6. Peer reviewing search strategies

A high-quality search strategy is required to ensure the accuracy and completeness of the evidence base used in a systematic review [10,11]. Due to their complexity, search strategies in bibliographic databases are prone to error [31].

The “Peer Review of Electronic Search Strategies” (PRESS) checklist was developed to support the peer review process [27]. Analyses of peer reviews using the PRESS checklist show that this tool identifies errors and may increase the number and quality of relevant references retrieved [104,105]. The peer review process using the checklist should be completed before the search strategy is run [25,31,104].

A peer review using the PRESS checklist is primarily a formal review. In addition, the completeness of the search strategy should be assessed by testing the final search strategy against a validation set containing an independent pool of relevant references [12], i.e. it is tested whether relevant references identified beforehand (see Section 2.3.2) can be found by the search strategy used.

See example: Peer reviewing search strategies (bib. Databases)

2.3.7. Conducting searches, downloading records, and managing references

After development, search strategies should be saved individually in each database for later use. It should be ensured that each strategy fulfils the current quality assurance requirements. After conducting the search in the selected databases, all references retrieved are downloaded, combined, and prepared for the screening process. For this purpose, the use of reference management software (RMS) such as EndNote [106], RefWorks [107] or Mendeley [108] is recommended [109-111]. These software programs enable the efficient management of references, including in-text citation [112].

Searching several databases produces duplicates. Qi et al. [113] and Bramer et al. [114] have developed methods for removing duplicates, which involve a stepwise (semi-) automatic comparison of references.

Duplicates can also be directly deleted during the search by means of the accession number. For instance, search strings can be generated with the accession numbers of references already identified in MEDLINE and Embase; it is then possible to exclude these records from a search in CENTRAL [3].

Some interfaces also offer the option of directly deleting duplicates in the bibliographic database via a search command (e.g. in Ovid MEDLINE with the command “..dedup x [search line]”).

In Ovid it is also possible to conduct separate searches in each database with individual search strategies and then deduplicate [33]. The individual database searches can be run

Copyright © EUnetHTA 2016. All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced without an explicit acknowledgement of the source and EUnetHTA's expressed consent

simultaneously by limiting the search result to the respective databases using Ovid database codes [115]. Once this is done the duplicates can be removed by Ovid.

See example: Conducting searches, downloading records etc (bib. Databases)

2.3.8. Screening citations (technical process)

After the references have been saved in a RMS, the selection process begins. The documentation of this process must be transparent and include the decision on the inclusion or exclusion of each reference retrieved [5,25].

The selection of references is usually administered by a RMS or by manual handling of paper copies [5]. In practice this is often problematic, particularly if the search produces a large number of hits. Internet-based systems such as Abstrackr [116], Rayyan [117], Covidence [118], and EPPI-Reviewer [15] have therefore been developed which, in addition to documenting the assessment of the references, offer the advantage of documenting the consensus process if assessments between reviewers differ.

In a 2-step procedure, the titles and abstracts of the references are first screened against the inclusion and exclusion criteria, followed by the screening of the full texts of potentially relevant publications identified in the first step [5,25,119]. The screening of titles and abstracts usually involves two reviewers to reduce the possibility of missing relevant publications [25]. The selection of studies to be included in the systematic review also should always be performed by at least two reviewers [119]. Current approaches aim to automatically support the screening at title and abstract level (e.g. text mining as a second screener; improving workflow through screening prioritization) [120].

In the study selection process, information specialists are increasingly involved in data management between different software applications [9,28]. In addition, they play a key role in the ordering of full texts. Due to complex copyright and licensing conditions, full texts are obtained via various routes. Copyright and licensing conditions have to be checked separately for each full text. Most scientific institutions, such as HTA agencies, possess licences for the most important medical journals, are members of national consortia, use ordering services such as Subito or Infotrieve, or obtain articles via library or open access. The time and costs required for ordering full texts should also be considered when planning information retrieval [121].

See example: Screening citations (bib. Databases)

2.3.9. Documenting and reporting the search process

Internal documentation

The search process should be documented in real time, i.e. both at the time of the development of the search strategy and the conduct of the search, and not retrospectively [5,25]. The aim is to document the search process as exactly as possible so that all information required for reporting is available [3]. The strategy for each bibliographic database, including the hits per line, should be copied and pasted as run and saved in text format [3,33]. Many databases offer facilities to save search strategies [33].

When exporting search results from the databases, the references should first be saved as text or RIS files and not imported directly into the RMS. This ensures the safe storage of search results [33]. In addition, information on the databases and interfaces searched should be documented, including the search dates and the search periods covered [3,5,33]. The complete documentation process is described in detail by Rader et al. [33].

Reporting

Clear and transparent reporting of all aspects of the search enables the assessment of quality and completeness [14,122], as well as search replication for future updates [4,5,13,33]. Several guidelines on reporting search methods are available [14,123]. Mullins et al. [123] analysed ten of them and identified eight common reporting elements (see Annexe 3). In addition, the study selection process should be displayed in a flowchart in the results section of the systematic review [4,5,25] (see PRISMA for a template [122,124]). Furthermore, the references of the studies included and excluded should be presented in separate reference lists [119,125]. In contrast to journal publications, HTA reports do not have space restrictions, and should therefore document the search process as precisely as necessary [25].

See example: Documenting and reporting (bib. Databases)

2.3.10. Updating searches

The literature search is usually conducted at the initial stage of the production of a systematic review. As a consequence, the results of a literature search may be outdated before the review is published [126-128]. The last search in a review should be conducted less than 12 months before publication [24,127]. For this reason, search updates are often conducted before the planned publication date.

Auto alerts [5] and other surveillance search techniques [60] can help identify new relevant articles immediately after publication. However, they usually cannot replace a search update but may provide early signals for the necessity of such a search.

Before conducting a search update, the performance of the search strategies in each database should be checked. For this purpose, the references included in the review are used to determine whether they can be identified by the search strategy. If this is not the case, the search strategy should be adapted [12]. Furthermore, it should be assessed whether other databases need to be searched [129].

To limit the number of hits retrieved, the search update should only identify references that are added to databases after the last search was conducted. In general, to limit the search period, the date the record entered the database, not the “publication date”, should be used [130]. A second technique excludes all references identified in a database in the initial search via a “NOT” link [131]. These “old” references can be reliably identified via their accession number. A third technique is to download all references from the update search and directly deduplicate them with the references from the initial search (e.g. using EndNote).

See example: Updating searches (bib. Databases)

2.4. Study registries

2.4.1. General aspects

The importance of study registries has increased markedly over the last years. In 2005, the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors specified that the prospective registration of clinical studies was a prerequisite for publication [132]. In 2007, the United States introduced mandatory registration of studies and summary results in ClinicalTrials.gov for most FDA-regulated drugs and devices [133]. In 2011 the European Medicines Agency (EMA) established the EU Clinical Trials Register (EU-CTR) [134] for most studies submitted during the drug approval process, and the posting of summary results became mandatory in July 2014 [135].

Depending on the topic investigated, between 15% (diagnostic or prognostic tests [136]) and nearly 100% (newly approved drugs [137,138]) of studies are registered in study registries.

Structure of study registries

Study registries are publicly available and commonly web-based databases or platforms. They contain key information from the study protocol, including outcomes, and/or summary results [26].

Different types of individual registries have been established (see Table 1). In addition, meta-registries such as the ICTRP Search Portal [139] contain regularly updated data from individual registries or access individual registries directly at the time of the search query.

Types of study registries	Examples
National registry	German Clinical Trials Register [140] Nederlands Trial Register [141]
Regulatory registry	ClinicalTrials.gov [142] EU Clinical Trials Register (Europe) [134] PharmNet.Bund – Arzneimittel-Informationssystem (Germany) [143]
Industry registry	GlaxoSmithKline Clinical Study Register [144] Forest Clinical Trial Registry [145]
Disease-specific registry	ALOIS: A Comprehensive Register of Dementia Studies [146]
Meta-registry	ICTRP Search Portal of the WHO [139]

Table 1: Types of study registries

The information contained in study registries is generally entered and updated by those responsible for the conduct of the study. However, entries may be incomplete, contain errors [147] or changed after registration [148,149]. In addition, the study status may be outdated [150].

Furthermore, many studies are still registered retrospectively instead of prospectively [43-45,151-153]. It should also be noted that registries have previously been closed down at

short notice (e.g. clinicalstudyresults.org [154] or the web crawler of the IFPMA Clinical Trials Portal [155]).

Study registries are not routinely searched [49,156], despite the fact that additional relevant studies may be identified in these sources [157-159].

2.4.2. Structuring the search strategy

Searches in study registries should be simple, highly sensitive, and ideally structured to search for one concept (e.g. intervention or indication) [160]. It is advisable to first conduct the search using the terms of the concept that can be most clearly specified and will thus probably generate the lowest number of hits. The scope of the search should only be limited further by adding the second concept if too many hits are retrieved in the first search. Due to the varying quality of the individual registry entries, it is not advisable to apply additional limitations (e.g. with regard to study status or phase).

See example: Structuring the search strategy (Study registries)

2.4.3. Choosing information sources

Several registries should be searched, as no registry contains all studies [150,160,161]. The search should include at least the ICTRP Search Portal as well as ClinicalTrials.gov [24,26,160]. The ICTRP Search Portal is a meta-registry currently containing 16 worldwide national study registries (including ClinicalTrials.gov) and covers a high percentage of clinical studies [150,162]. However, it only offers limited search functions [160] and often produces error messages [163]. In addition, the posting of study results is not mandatory, therefore major registries such as ClinicalTrials.gov should always be searched directly [160].

For systematic reviews of drugs, the relevant company registry [159], as well as the EMA registry (EU-CTR), should also be searched. In addition, national legislation should be considered: for instance, summary results are provided for drugs approved in Germany via the drug information system of PharmNet.Bund [143]. This database may include otherwise unavailable results from studies conducted outside Europe and the United States.

Only a few suitable disease-specific study registries. These registries are frequently established for temporary research programmes and are commonly no longer updated when funding ceases. They are thus not very useful and should only be searched for in exceptional cases [164].

See example: Choosing information sources (Study registries)

2.4.4. Developing search strategies

2.4.4.1. Identifying search terms

The syntax for the search in bibliographic databases provides the basis for the selection of search terms for the search in registries. Known terms of a search concept should be considered in a sensitive search [160]. It should be noted that registries such as ClinicalTrials.gov (see [165] for an example) and the ICTRP Search Portal offer a search

for synonyms [164]. Both provide a list of synonyms for search terms (in ICTRP this is only available via the “advanced search” function), which enables a reduction in the number of search terms. This is necessary because study registries only provide limited search functions and only a few search terms can thus be used [137].

A recent analysis has shown that the use of the generic drug name is sufficient in searches for newly approved drugs (since 2005) in ClinicalTrials.gov. In ICTRP and EU-CTR, the drug code also needs to be searched for [137]. When searching for the therapeutic indication, simple search terms usually lead to a complete search result only in ClinicalTrials.gov, as the “search for synonyms” function is adequate in this registry. In ICTRP and EU-CTR [137], the use of comprehensive search queries is recommended.

See example: Identifying search terms (Study registries)

2.4.4.2. Adapting the search syntax

The search syntax has to be adapted for each registry. The functionalities provided vary considerably and these differences need to be observed (e.g. concerning truncation, use of brackets, and implementation of Boolean operators). For example, brackets cannot be used to structure searches of the ICTRP Search Portal. Instead, Boolean operators are applied in an automatic order (NOT, AND, OR). In addition, complex search queries may generate error messages or errors which may not always be visible to the user.

Furthermore, in contrast to bibliographic databases, search lines in registries generally cannot be linked by means of operators. Glanville et al. provide an example of the adaption of the search syntax in ClinicalTrials.gov and the ICTRP Search Portal [160].

The York Health Economics Consortium provides a comprehensive overview of the search functions of different registries [166].

A sensitive search should be conducted as a single concept search using the “basic search” function [160,164].

See example: Adapting the search syntax (Study registries)

2.4.5. Peer reviewing search strategies

The peer review of search strategies developed for study registries should follow the procedure applied for bibliographic databases. The PRESS checklist [10,11] can be used as a guideline but should be adapted (e.g. if the list of synonyms for search terms for each study registry has been checked).

A check for completeness of the search should also be performed. For example, Glanville et al. describe an approach for identifying registry entries on known relevant studies [160]. To the relevant studies already identified in bibliographic databases in the preliminary search (see Section 2.3.2) a set of relevant registry entries can thus be determined. It is then tested whether the final search strategy actually identifies these entries. However, not all relevant studies can be linked to the corresponding registry entries since journal articles do not as a rule include study identifiers such as National Clinical Trial numbers [160].

See example: Peer reviewing search strategies (Study registries)

2.4.6. Conducting searches, downloading records and managing references

The search in study registries should follow the procedure applied for bibliographic databases.

Major registries such as ClinicalTrials.gov offer the direct export of search results as xml or text files [166], which can then be imported into a RMS using an import filter. For ClinicalTrials.gov this type of filter is provided by the Cochrane Information Retrieval Methods Group [167]. The search results can then be processed for screening.

If no export function is available, the search results can be copied and pasted into Excel and processed [164].

As different registries may provide different information on the same study, the deletion of duplicates is not advisable (except for entries with identical registration numbers).

See example: Conducting searches, downloading records etc. (Study registries)

2.4.7. Screening citations (technical process)

The screening of search results is similar to the procedure applied for bibliographic databases. Using a screening tool (see Section 2.3.8), the registry entries should be screened by two reviewers. The information on the relevant studies contained in the registry entries (study protocol, and, if applicable, study results and/or other documents) should be saved.

See example: Screening citations (Study registries)

2.4.8. Documenting and reporting the search process

The documentation of the search in study registries follows the procedure applied for bibliographic searches: real-time documentation of the name of the registry searched, the search date, the number of hits retrieved, as well as storage of the search strategy and the raw search results. If the database has more than one interface (basic and advanced search) this should also be noted. If it is not possible to store raw results, it is advisable to document the search results with screenshots to enable later comparison with the results of a search update [164].

No consensus exists as to which type of registry information should be reported. Balshem et al. recommend to: "Construct a table that provides information on trials found in the registry, their publication status, and whether they are completed or currently active trials, and provide a count of the number of unique trials found along with their status at the time of the search [...] Match trials with publications found from the standard search, noting 1) trials with an entry in ClinicalTrials.gov, and 2) trials for which no publication was found" [26].

The search strategy itself should also be reported to enable the reproduction of search results [156,160,168].

See example: Documenting and reporting (Study registries)

2.4.9. Updating searches

If applicable, a search update in registries should be performed close to the time of the search update in bibliographic databases. It is advisable not to use time limits (e.g. by means of the entry date) during the direct search in each study registry and instead perform a manual comparison using registration numbers. This duplicate check can be carried out in a RMS or in Excel.

If ongoing studies were identified in the initial search, their status should be checked at the time of the search update.

See example: Updating searches (Study registries)

2.5. Searching for unpublished company documents

Full information on clinical studies and their results is required to provide adequate assessments of drugs and non-drug interventions. This can best be achieved with clinical study reports, which are submitted to regulatory authorities during the approval procedure for a drug, but are rarely made publicly available.

These documents are generally prepared following the International Conference on Harmonisation's Guideline for Industry: Structure and Content of Clinical Study Reports (ICH E3) [169] and provide detailed information on the methods and results of a study [170]. They contain far more relevant information than journal publications or registry reports [21,169,170]. Although clinical study reports are considerably longer than journals publications [171] and require specific expertise with regard to data extraction and assessment, they are indispensable for gaining an unbiased picture of the available research evidence [21,40,169-172].

In 2014 the EU Parliament passed a law specifying the publication of complete clinical study reports for all studies used in the drug approval process from 2016 onwards [173]. In addition, EMA has introduced a new policy on data transparency, which includes the publication of clinical study reports [174], but it is still unclear how this will be implemented [175,176]. No plans currently exist for the publication of reports on clinical studies of medical devices.

Pharmaceutical companies are also increasing data transparency. Since 2013, GlaxoSmithKline has published clinical study reports of all GSK drugs approved or discontinued from 2000 and onwards [177]. Anonymized individual patient data and/or supporting documents from clinical studies can be requested from pharmaceutical companies via the Clinical Study Data Request website [178]. However, such requests are sometimes rejected [179].

Search process

As clinical study reports are not routinely published by regulatory authorities, pharmaceutical companies or medical device manufacturers, the latter two should be asked to provide unpublished information [26]. This should follow a standardized approach

using template letters or forms. For example, IQWiG currently applies the following approach for this purpose [180]: Before requesting data, an agreement is reached between the authors of the systematic review and the relevant company concerning the transmission of information on the drug of interest.¹ In this context, to avoid bias by selective provision of data it is important for the company to agree a priori to the publication of all relevant data (not the publication of all full documents). A 2-step procedure then follows: Firstly, the company is asked to provide a complete list of studies on the drug or medical device to be assessed. Secondly, the authors identify potentially relevant studies from this list and request detailed information from the company on unpublished studies or additional information on published studies.

2.6. Further information sources and techniques

In addition to the primary search sources named in Sections 2.3, 2.4 and 2.5, project-specific information sources and search techniques should be considered. Some examples are briefly presented in the following sections.

2.6.1. Regulatory documents

Regulatory authorities publish sections of reports prepared during the approval process [26]. These documents can offer important insights into clinical studies [181] and may also include a list of studies that are potentially relevant for a systematic review. Research evidence shows that the search for regulatory documents can identify unpublished studies or unpublished data from published studies [19,20,25,26,41,182]. However, similar to other sources such as reports from study registries, regulatory documents do not usually contain all relevant information on a study [172].

Websites of regulatory agencies are rarely included as information sources in systematic searches [182,183]. In Europe, information on centrally authorized drugs (e.g. European public assessment reports) can be found on the EMA website [184]. In the United States, the Medical and Statistical Reviews of drugs approved by the FDA can be found via Drugs@FDA [185].

In contrast to the United States, there is no centralized authorization procedure for medical devices in Europe. If clinical studies are conducted for European market access, the EU member states are obliged to post the corresponding information in the European Databank on Medical Devices (EUDAMED) [186]. However, this source is not publicly accessible. Information on medical devices is sometimes made available by individual countries, for example, in the NICE list of interventional procedures in the UK [187]. In the United States, information on FDA-approved devices, including data used for approval, is available via Devices@FDA [188].

Search process

¹ Agreement upon manufacturer data between IQWiG and the German Association of Research-based Pharmaceutical Companies
https://www.iqwig.de/en/press/press_releases/press_releases/agreement_upon_manufacturer_data.2246.html

A search for regulatory documents should at least include the FDA and EMA websites. Regulatory authorities in other countries such as Canada [189] or Japan [190] also publish potentially relevant documents and should be considered in individual cases.

A **search** for the drug name and active ingredient (or for the name of the medical device) is conducted on the websites of the relevant regulatory authorities. If no relevant documents are found, it is advisable to also conduct a search in Google (e.g. for “FDA advisory committee” AND “active ingredient”). Turner [191] has provided a detailed overview on how to access and process FDA documents [191]. However, navigating on the FDA website and searching in documents can be challenging [147,192].

The **internal documentation** for regulatory sources used in a systematic review includes information on the website, the search date, and the search terms used. The regulatory documents are saved and the text is screened to identify information on clinical studies and any other potentially relevant information.

In addition to the search details (website, search date, search terms), the number and titles of the regulatory documents identified should be **reported in the review**. It should also be described whether further studies or data were found in addition to the literature identified in other sources.

2.6.2. Queries to authors

The reviewers should contact the study authors if the published reports of potentially relevant studies lack the necessary details required to ascertain a study’s eligibility or to determine its methodological quality [4,25,193].

It may also be necessary to contact the study authors to clear any uncertainties about a study’s publication status. The study author can often help link the identified information to full publications, confirm that there was no subsequent publication, inform about soon-to-be-published publications, and clear uncertainties surrounding duplicate publication [4].

Overall, there is no clear evidence stating what the most effective method for obtaining missing data from the study authors is, but contacting authors by e-mail seems to be a useful method [194]. In addition, the evidence shows that multiple requests do not seem to lead to more comprehensive information or to a greater response rate than single requests [194]. Sending an email request to each study author may therefore be considered sufficient.

When reviewers contact study authors, they should report to what extent and how it was done, i.e. the number of studies for which authors were contacted, the response rate, the information requested and the response from study authors to the request [4,193].

Systematically contacting study authors of all identified relevant studies, as well as topic experts and manufacturers, may also be considered to identify additional unpublished, ongoing or difficult to locate studies that may be useful for the review.

2.6.3. Further search techniques

The conventional search approach of applying Boolean operators (see 1.1.5) to subject heading and free-text queries continues to dominate literature reviews, as it remains an effective method for searching the major online bibliographic databases [195]. However, sensitivity and specificity issues relating to Boolean searching have led researchers to investigate a variety of alternative search approaches. Checking reference lists (backward

citations), citation tracking (forward citations), using the “similar articles” function in the database, hand searching and methods of automated retrieval are some examples.

Although there is only limited evidence of the effectiveness of these approaches, the available evidence indicates that checking reference lists, using the “similar articles” function, and (with limitations) citation tracking, might be useful approaches in a comprehensive literature search [196]. For instance, this applies to searches for complex evidence [59,61], to cases where the research question cannot be clearly defined [195], or the topic of interest is commonly missing from the title, abstract or subject headings of a reference (e.g. outcome measures [61,197]).

Verifying the studies identified solely by additional search techniques (e.g. checking reference lists) can validate the effectiveness of searches in bibliographic databases [56]. If these searches miss relevant articles, revising the search strategy and rerunning the search should be considered [16,198].

The **documentation** of the application of additional search techniques depends on the technique applied. The criteria for the reference lists chosen and the justification for the selection of citations should be documented [199]. The number of studies additionally identified should also be stated. The documentation of handsearching journals is described in Section 2.6.4. In contrast, no documentation standard seems to exist for the application of the “automatic retrieval” function in bibliographic databases.

Further information on this topic can be found in the chapter “Value of using different search approaches” on SuRe Info in [196].

Section 2.3.2 provides information on the application of the above-mentioned search techniques in preliminary searches.

2.6.4. Conference abstracts

Only about half of all studies first presented as abstracts will subsequently reach full publication, and studies reported in abstracts are more often published in full text if their results show a positive treatment effect or have significant results [17]. Conference abstracts often provide limited details of study methodology, and may contain limited reporting of outcome data [200]. There can be differences between data presented in an abstract and that included in the full publication [5,201]. For these reasons, it is not recommended to routinely search for abstracts and reviewers should always try to obtain the full report or further study details, before considering whether to include the results in the review [5,200].

However, especially if systematic literature searches for published studies yield no or very few citations, searching conference abstracts and proceedings may be considered to identify additional studies [200]. Conference abstracts and proceedings may be identified by searching bibliographic databases that index meeting reports [4], such as Embase, BIOSIS Previews and Scopus, and by hand searching of journal supplements, meeting abstract books, and conference websites [200].

If the project team decides to include conference abstracts, they should report the search approaches used to identify them. Handsearching or scanning the pdfs of conference proceedings should be reported by listing the names of conference proceedings, years searched and search terms used (when relevant). For reporting searches in bibliographic databases, please see section 2.3.9. The project team should also describe how they have

assessed the identified abstracts for inclusion, how the data were used and their effects on the results of the review [200].

2.6.5. Dissertation and reports

Searching for dissertations and other reports seems helpful only in exceptional cases (e.g. religion and mental health [202]). Numerous databases exist for these types of documents (e.g. BL EThOS, DART Europe, ProQuest Dissertations & Theses Database, OpenGrey, NIH RePORTER). However, it is not recommended to routinely search these sources. It has been shown that “searching for and retrieving unpublished dissertations involves considerable time and effort, and appears to influence the conclusion of a review only rarely” [203].

3. Conclusion and main recommendations

The information sources listed in the present guideline show different strengths and weaknesses. For instance, a search in bibliographic databases is generally easy to implement. However, many studies are never published and cannot be found in these databases. The production of a systematic review thus requires the regular search of additional information sources, even though this usually involves considerable additional effort.

Unpublished company documents (clinical study reports) provide the most comprehensive information on clinical studies and should therefore be considered as additional sources. They minimize the problem of reporting bias and are thus indispensable for gaining an unbiased picture of the available research evidence. As clinical study reports are often not publicly accessible, they should be routinely requested from the responsible companies.

Study registries are also an important information source. They offer the advantage that the registration of studies and the posting of study results are now mandatory in many countries. However, the corresponding laws largely apply to studies of drugs submitted to regulatory authorities during the drug approval process. This also applies to regulatory documents, which often have different structures and formats and are difficult to search.

Queries to study authors of study publications are a further option to obtain relevant additional information on studies identified in a literature search. However, such queries often remain unanswered.

Further search techniques, such as checking reference lists or using the “related citations” function of relevant publications, should be used as standard additional information sources. If searches conducted in bibliographic databases have failed to identify relevant published studies included in the reference lists, search strategies should be reviewed and, if necessary, adjusted.

A search for conference abstracts may be of only limited use and is primarily conducted to identify further studies.

The types of information sources considered in a systematic review largely depend on the topic of interest, the review’s objective, the risk of reporting bias, the time frame of the work, and the available resources. The requirements outlined in AMSTAR (a measurement tool for the “assessment of multiple systematic reviews” [125]) may be regarded as a minimum standard; i.e. a search in at least two bibliographic databases plus a further information source (in addition to the screening of reference lists of included publications).

The choice of information sources for identifying unpublished studies should be based on the completeness and reliability of data: for instance, clinical study reports and registry entries should be preferred to conference abstracts.

Annexe 1. Bibliography

1. National Institutes of Health. PubMed help: status subsets [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK3827/table/pubmedhelp.T.status_subsets/?report=objectonly.
2. Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Sterne JAC. Chapter 8: assessing risk of bias in included studies [internet]. In: Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions: version 5.1.0. 03.2011 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://handbook.cochrane.org>.
3. Lefebvre C, Manheimer E, Glanville J. Chapter 6: searching for studies [internet]. In: Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions: version 5.1.0. 03.2011 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://handbook.cochrane.org>.
4. Relevo R, Balshem H. Finding evidence for comparing medical interventions: methods guide for comparative effectiveness reviews; AHRQ publication no. 11-EHC021-EF [internet]. 01.2011 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/276/605/MethodsGuide_Relevo_FindingEvidenceforComparing_20120430.pdf.
5. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. CRD's guidance for undertaking reviews in health care. York: CRD; 2009. Available from: https://www.york.ac.uk/media/crd/Systematic_Reviews.pdf.
6. Waffenschmidt S, Janzen T, Hausner E, Kaiser T. Simple search techniques in PubMed are potentially suitable for evaluating the completeness of systematic reviews. J Clin Epidemiol 2013; 66(6): 660-665.
7. Hausner E, Waffenschmidt S, Kaiser T, Simon M. Routine development of objectively derived search strategies. Syst Rev 2012; 1: 19.
8. Simon M, Hausner E, Klaus SF, Dunton N. Identifying nurse staffing research in Medline: development and testing of empirically derived search strategies with the PubMed interface. BMC Med Res Methodol 2010; 10: 76.
9. Lefebvre C, Glanville J, Wieland LS, Coles B, Weightman AL. Methodological developments in searching for studies for systematic reviews: past, present and future? Syst Rev 2013; 2: 78.
10. 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. Available from: http://www.cadth.ca/media/pdf/477_PRESS-Peer-Review-Electronic-Search-Strategies_tr_e.pdf.
11. Sampson M, McGowan J, Cogo E, Grimshaw J, Moher D, Lefebvre C. An evidence-based practice guideline for the peer review of electronic search strategies. J Clin Epidemiol 2009; 62(9): 944-952.
12. Sampson M, McGowan J. Inquisitio Validus Index Medicus: a simple method of validating MEDLINE systematic review searches. Res Syn Meth 2011; 2(2): 103-109.
13. Yoshii A, Plaut DA, McGraw KA, Anderson MJ, Wellik KE. Analysis of the reporting of search strategies in Cochrane systematic reviews. J Med Libr Assoc 2009; 97(1): 21-29.

14. Sampson M, McGowan J, Tetzlaff J, Cogo E, Moher D. No consensus exists on search reporting methods for systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61(8): 748-754.
15. EPPI-Centre. EPPI-Reviewer 4 [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/Default.aspx?alias=eppi.ioe.ac.uk/cms/er4>.
16. Horsley T, Dingwall O, Tetzlaff JM, Sampson M. Checking reference lists to find additional studies for systematic reviews. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2009; (1): MR000026.
17. Scherer RW, Langenberg P, Von Elm E. Full publication of results initially presented in abstracts. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007; (2): MR000005.
18. Gibson CA, Bailey BW, Carper MJ, LeCheminant JD, Kirk EP, Huang G et al. Author contacts for retrieval of data for a meta-analysis on exercise and diet restriction. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2006; 22(2): 267-270.
19. MacLean CH, Morton SC, Ofman JJ, Roth EA, Shekelle PG. How useful are unpublished data from the Food and Drug Administration in meta-analysis. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003; 56(1): 44-51.
20. Turner EH, Matthews AM, Linardatos E, Tell RA, Rosenthal R. Selective publication of antidepressant trials and its influence on apparent efficacy. *N Engl J Med* 2008; 358(3): 252-260.
21. Wieseler B, Kerekes MF, Vervoelgyi V, McGauran N, Kaiser T. Impact of document type on reporting quality of clinical drug trials: a comparison of registry reports, clinical study reports, and journal publications. *BMJ* 2012; 344: d8141.
22. Isojärvi J, Ormstad SS. Summarized research in information retrieval for HTA [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.sure-info.org>.
23. Higgins JPT, Green S. *Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions: version 5.1.0* [internet]. 03.2011 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://handbook.cochrane.org>.
24. Chandler J, Churchill R, Higgins J, Lasserson T, Tovey D. Methodological standards for the conduct of new Cochrane Intervention Reviews: version 2.3 [internet]. 22.12.2016 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://www.editorial-unit.cochrane.org/sites/editorial-unit.cochrane.org/files/uploads/MECIR_conduct_standards%202.3%2002122013.pdf.
25. Eden J, Levit L, Berg A, Morton S. Finding what works in health care: standards for systematic reviews [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://nationalacademies.org/HMD/Reports/2011/Finding-What-Works-in-Health-Care-Standards-for-Systematic-Reviews.aspx>.
26. Balshem H, Stevens A, Ansari M, Norris S, Kansagara D, Shamliyan T et al. Finding grey literature evidence and assessing for outcome and analysis reporting biases when comparing medical interventions: AHRQ and the Effective Health Care Program; methods guide for comparative effectiveness reviews; AHRQ publication no. 13(14)-EHC096-EF [internet]. 11.2013 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/486/1751/methods-guidance-reporting-bias-131118.pdf>.
27. Mc Gowan J, Sampson M, Salzwedel DM, Cogo E, Foester V, Lefebvre C. PRESS: Peer Review Electronic Search Strategies; 2015 guideline explanation and elaboration (PRESS E&E) [internet]. 01.2016 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: https://www.cadth.ca/sites/default/files/pdf/CP0015_PRESS_Update_Report_2016.pdf.

28. McGowan J, Sampson M. Systematic reviews need systematic searchers. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2005; 93(1): 74-80.
29. Harris MR. The librarian's roles in the systematic review process: a case study. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2005; 93(1): 81-87.
30. Beverley CA, Booth A, Bath PA. The role of the information specialist in the systematic review process: a health information case study. *Health Info Libr J* 2003; 20(2): 65-74.
31. Sampson M, McGowan J. Errors in search strategies were identified by type and frequency. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2006; 59(10): 1057-1063.
32. Rethlefsen ML, Murad MH, Livingston EH. Engaging medical librarians to improve the quality of review articles. *JAMA* 2014; 312(10): 999-1000.
33. Rader T, Mann M, Stansfield C, Cooper C, Sampson M. Methods for documenting systematic review searches: a discussion of common issues. *Res Syn Meth* 2014; 5(2): 98-115.
34. Koffel JB. Use of recommended search strategies in systematic reviews and the impact of librarian involvement: a cross-sectional survey of recent authors. *PLoS One* 2015; 10(5): e0125931.
35. Golder S, Loke Y, McIntosh HM. Poor reporting and inadequate searches were apparent in systematic reviews of adverse effects. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61(5): 440-448.
36. Rethlefsen ML, Farrell AM, Osterhaus Trzasko LC, Brigham TJ. Librarian co-authors correlated with higher quality reported search strategies in general internal medicine systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015; 68(6): 617-626.
37. Zhang L, Sampson M, McGowan J. Reporting the role of the expert searcher in Cochrane reviews. *Evid Based Libr Inf Pract* 2006; 1(4): 3-16.
38. Riveros C, Dechartres A, Perrodeau E, Haneef R, Boutron I, Ravaud P. Timing and completeness of trial results posted at ClinicalTrials.gov and published in journals. *PLoS Med* 2013; 10(12): e1001566.
39. Ross JS, Mulvey GK, Hines EM, Nissen SE, Krumholz HM. Trial publication after registration in ClinicalTrials.gov: a cross-sectional analysis. *PLoS Med* 2009; 6(9): e1000144.
40. McGauran N, Wieseler B, Kreis J, Schüller YB, Kölsch H, Kaiser T. Reporting bias in medical research: a narrative review. *Trials* 2010; 11: 37.
41. Song F, Parekh S, Hooper L, Loke YK, Ryder J, Sutton AJ et al. Dissemination and publication of research findings: an updated review of related biases. *Health Technol Assess* 2010; 14(8): iii-xi, 1-220.
42. Köhler M, Haag S, Biester K, Brockhaus AC, McGauran N, Grouven U et al. Information on new drugs at market entry: retrospective analysis of health technology assessment reports versus regulatory reports, journal publications, and registry reports. *BMJ* 2015; 350: h796.
43. Pranic S, Marusic A. Changes to registration elements and results in a cohort of ClinicalTrials.gov trials were not reflected in published articles. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016; 70: 26-37.

44. Su CX, Han M, Ren J, Li WY, Yue SJ, Hao YF et al. Empirical evidence for outcome reporting bias in randomized clinical trials of acupuncture: comparison of registered records and subsequent publications. *Trials* 2015; 16: 28.
45. De Oliveira GS Jr, Jung MJ, McCarthy RJ. Discrepancies between randomized controlled trial registry entries and content of corresponding manuscripts reported in anesthesiology journals. *Anesth Analg* 2015; 121(4): 1030-1033.
46. Riehm KE, Azar M, Thombs BD. Transparency of outcome reporting and trial registration of randomized controlled trials in top psychosomatic and behavioral health journals: a 5-year follow-up. *J Psychosom Res* 2015; 79(1): 1-12.
47. Tang E, Ravaud P, Riveros C, Perrodeau E, Dechartres A. Comparison of serious adverse events posted at ClinicalTrials.gov and published in corresponding journal articles. *BMC Med* 2015; 13: 189.
48. Hartung DM, Zarin DA, Guise JM, McDonagh M, Paynter R, Helfand M. Reporting discrepancies between the ClinicalTrials.gov results database and peer-reviewed publications. *Ann Intern Med* 2014; 160(7): 477-483.
49. Kreis J, Panteli D, Busse R. How health technology assessment agencies address the issue of unpublished data. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2014; 30(1): 34-43.
50. Forsetlund L, Kirkehei I, Harboe I, Odgaard-Jensen J. A comparison of two search methods for determining the scope of systematic reviews and health technology assessments. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2012; 28(1): 59-64.
51. Statens Beredning för Medicinsk Utvärdering. Utvärdering av metoder i hälso- och sjukvården: en handbok. Stockholm: SBU; 2012. Available from: <http://www.sbu.se/upload/ebm/metodbok/SBUshandbok.pdf>.
52. Khan K, Kunz R, Kleijnen J, Antes G. Systematic reviews to support evidence-based medicine: how to review and apply findings of healthcare research. London: Royal Society of Medicine Press; 2003.
53. Booth A. Unpacking your literature search toolbox: on search styles and tactics. *Health Info Libr J* 2008; 25(4): 313-317.
54. Brettell AJ, Long AF. Comparison of bibliographic databases for information on the rehabilitation of people with severe mental illness. *Bull Med Libr Assoc* 2001; 89(4): 353-362.
55. Sayers A. Tips and tricks in performing a systematic review. *Br J Gen Pract* 2007; 57(545): 999.
56. Whitlock EP, Lin JS, Chou R, Shekelle P, Robinson KA. Using existing systematic reviews in complex systematic reviews. *Ann Intern Med* 2008; 148(10): 776-782.
57. European Network for Health Technology Assessment. EUnetHTA POP database [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://eunetha.dimdi.de/PopDB>.
58. Centre for Reviews and Dissemination. PROSPERO [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.crd.york.ac.uk/PROSPERO/>.
59. Greenhalgh T, Peacock R. Effectiveness and efficiency of search methods in systematic reviews of complex evidence: audit of primary sources. *BMJ* 2005; 331(7524): 1064-1065.

60. Sampson M, Shojania KG, McGowan J, Daniel R, Rader T, Iansavichene AE et al. Surveillance search techniques identified the need to update systematic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61(8): 755-762.
61. O'Leary N, Tiernan E, Walsh D, Lucey N, Kirkova J, Davis MP. The pitfalls of a systematic MEDLINE review in palliative medicine: symptom assessment instruments. *Am J Hosp Palliat Care* 2007; 24(3): 181-184.
62. Schlosser RW, Wendt O, Bhavnani S, Nail-Chiwetalu B. Use of information-seeking strategies for developing systematic reviews and engaging in evidence-based practice: the application of traditional and comprehensive Pearl Growing; a review. *Int J Lang Commun Disord* 2006; 41(5): 567-582.
63. Huang X, Lin J, Demner-Fushman D. Evaluation of PICO as a knowledge representation for clinical questions. In: American Medical Informatics Association (Ed). *AMIA 2006 Symposium Proceedings*; 11.-15.11.2006; Washington DC, USA. Bethesda: Curran Associates; 2006. p. 359-363.
64. Royle P, Bain L, Waugh N. Systematic reviews of epidemiology in diabetes: finding the evidence. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2005; 5: 2.
65. Sampson M, Barrowman NJ, Moher D. Should meta-analysts search Embase in addition to Medline? *J Clin Epidemiol* 2003; 56(10): 943-955.
66. Royle P, Waugh N. Literature searching for clinical and cost-effectiveness studies used in health technology assessment reports carried out for the National Institute for Clinical Excellence appraisal system. *Health Technol Assess* 2003; 7(34): iii, ix-x, 1-51.
67. Suarez-Almazor ME, Belseck E, Homik J, Dorgan M, Ramos-Remus C. Identifying clinical trials in the medical literature with electronic databases: MEDLINE alone is not enough. *Control Clin Trials* 2000; 21(5): 476-487.
68. Whiting P, Westwood M, Burke M, Sterne J, Glanville J. Systematic reviews of test accuracy should search a range of databases to identify primary studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61(4): 357.
69. Crumley ET, Wiebe N, Cramer K, Klassen TP, Hartling L. Which resources should be used to identify RCT/CCTs for systematic reviews: a systematic review. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2005; 5: 24.
70. Betrán AP, Say L, Gülmezoglu AM, Allen T, Hampson L. Effectiveness of different databases in identifying studies for systematic reviews: experience from the WHO systematic review of maternal morbidity and mortality. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2005; 5: 6.
71. Lemeshow AR, Blum RE, Berlin JA, Stoto MA, Colditz GA. Searching one or two databases was insufficient for meta-analysis of observational studies. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005; 58(9): 867-873.
72. Slobogean GP, Verma A, Giustini D, Slobogean BL, Mulpuri K. MEDLINE, EMBASE, and Cochrane index most primary studies but not abstracts included in orthopedic meta-analyses. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2009; 62(12): 1261-1267.
73. Royle P, Milne R. Literature searching for randomized controlled trials used in Cochrane reviews: rapid versus exhaustive searches. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2003; 19(4): 591-603.
74. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Developing NICE guidelines: the manual [internet]. 10.2014 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from:

<http://www.nice.org.uk/Media/Default/About/what-we-do/our-programmes/developing-NICE-guidelines-the-manual.pdf>.

75. De Freitas AE, Herbert RD, Latimer J, Ferreira PH. Searching the LILACS database for Portuguese- and Spanish-language randomized trials in physiotherapy was difficult. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2005; 58(3): 233-237.

76. Waffenschmidt S, Hausner E, Kaiser T. An evaluation of searching the German CCMed database for the production of systematic reviews. *Health Info Libr J* 2010; 27(4): 262-267.

77. Stevinson C, Lawlor DA. Searching multiple databases for systematic reviews: added value or diminishing returns? *Complement Ther Med* 2004; 12(4): 228-232.

78. Pilkington K. Searching for CAM evidence: an evaluation of therapy-specific search strategies. *J Altern Complement Med* 2007; 13(4): 451-459.

79. Jenuwine ES, Floyd JA. Comparison of Medical Subject Headings and text-word searches in MEDLINE to retrieve studies on sleep in healthy individuals. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2004; 92(3): 349-353.

80. Kastner M, Wilczynski NL, Walker-Dilks C, McKibbin KA, Haynes B. Age-specific search strategies for Medline. *J Med Internet Res* 2006; 8(4): e25.

81. Gehanno JF, Rollin L, Le Jean T, Louvel A, Darmoni S, Shaw W. Precision and recall of search strategies for identifying studies on return-to-work in Medline. *J Occup Rehabil* 2009; 19(3): 223-230.

82. O'Mara-Eves A, Brunton G, McDaid D, Kavanagh J, Oliver S, Thomas J. Techniques for identifying cross-disciplinary and 'hard-to-detect' evidence for systematic review. *Res Syn Meth* 2014; 5(1): 50-59.

83. Crumley E, Blackhall K. Setting up search strategies for systematic reviews (or, how many ways can you spell diarrhea?). *Bib Medica Can* 2003; 24(4): 167-168.

84. Jenkins M. Evaluation of methodological search filters: a review. *Health Info Libr J* 2004; 21(3): 148-163.

85. Thompson J, Davis J, Mazerolle L. A systematic method for search term selection in systematic reviews. *Res Syn Meth* 2014; 5(2): 87-97.

86. Paynter RA, Bañez LL, E. B, Erinoff E, Lege-Matsuura J, Potter S et al. EPC methods: an exploration of the use of text-mining software in systematic reviews; AHRQ publication no 16-EHC023-EF [internet]. 04.2016 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <https://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/625/2214/text-mining-report-160419.pdf>.

87. Mesgarpour B, Mesgarpour M, Müller M, Herkner H. Developing software for combining search queries to design efficient search strategies [internet]. In: Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 19th Cochrane Colloquium; 19.-22.10.2011; Madrid, Spain. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2011-madrid/developing-software-combining-search-queries-design-efficient-search-strategies>.

88. Damarell RA, Tieman J, Sladek RM, Davidson PM. Development of a heart failure filter for Medline: an objective approach using evidence-based clinical practice guidelines as an alternative to hand searching. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2011; 11: 12.

89. Petrova M, Sutcliffe P, Fulford KW, Dale J. Search terms and a validated brief search filter to retrieve publications on health-related values in Medline: a word frequency analysis study. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2011; 19(3): 479-488.

90. Glanville JM, Lefebvre C, Miles JNV, Camosso-Stefinovic J. How to identify randomized controlled trials in Medline: ten years on. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2006; 94: 130-136.
91. Ananiadou S, Rea B, Okazaki N, Procter R, Thomas J. Supporting systematic reviews using text mining. *Soc Sci Comput Rev* 2009; 27(4): 509-523.
92. Glanville J, Fleetwood K, Yellowlees A, Kaunelis D, Mensinkai S. Development and testing of search filters to identify economic evaluations in MEDLINE and EMBASE. Ottawa: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2009. Available from: http://www.cadth.ca/media/pdf/H0490_Search_Filters_for_Economic_Evaluations_mg_e.pdf.
93. Anthony L. AntConc 3.2.1w [Software]. 2007. Available.
94. Younger P, Boddy K. When is a search not a search? A comparison of searching the AMED complementary health database via EBSCOhost, OVID and DIALOG. *Health Info Libr J* 2009; 26(2): 126-135.
95. InterTASC Information Specialists' Sub-Group. The InterTASC Information Specialists' Sub-Group Search Filter Resource [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.york.ac.uk/inst/crd/intertasc/index.htm>.
96. Bak G, Mierzewski-Urban M, Fitzsimmons H, Morrison A, Maden-Jenkins M. A pragmatic critical appraisal instrument for search filters: introducing the CADTH CAI. *Health Info Libr J* 2009; 26(3): 211-219.
97. Glanville J, Bayliss S, Booth A, Dundar Y, Fernandes H, Fleeman ND et al. So many filters, so little time: the development of a search filter appraisal checklist. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2008; 96(4): 356-361.
98. Health Information Research Unit. Search filters for MEDLINE in Ovid syntax and the PubMed translation [internet]. 30.04.2013 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://hiru.mcmaster.ca/hiru/HIRU_Hedges_MEDLINE_Strategies.aspx.
99. Waffenschmidt S, Guddat C. Searches for randomized controlled trials of drugs in MEDLINE and EMBASE using only generic drug names compared with searches applied in current practice in systematic reviews. *Res Syn Meth* 2015; 6(2): 188-194.
100. Janzen T, Hausner E, Waffenschmidt S. Entwicklung und Evaluation von RCT- und SR-Filtern für die Suche nach nicht verschlagworteten Datensätzen in PubMed [internet]. In: Entscheiden trotz Unsicherheit: 14. Jahrestagung des Deutschen Netzwerks Evidenzbasierte Medizin; 15.-16.03.2013; Berlin, Deutschland. 11.03.2013 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.egms.de/static/de/meetings/ebm2013/13ebm059.shtml>.
101. Damarell RA, Tieman JJ, Sladek RM. OvidSP Medline-to-PubMed search filter translation: a methodology for extending search filter range to include PubMed's unique content. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2013; 13: 86.
102. DeLuca JB, Mullins MM, Lyles CM. Developing a comprehensive search strategy for evidence based systematic reviews. *Evid Based Libr Inf Pract* 2008; 3(1): 3-32.
103. Bradley SM. Examination of the clinical queries and systematic review "hedges" in EMBASE and MEDLINE. *Journal of the Canadian Health Libraries Association* 2010; 31(2): 27-37.
104. Relevo R, Paynter R. Peer review of search strategies: methods research report; AHRQ publication no. 12-EHC068-EF [internet]. 06.2012 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available

from: http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/ehc/products/342/1131/Peer-Review-of-Search-Strategies_FinalMethodsReport_20120607.pdf.

105. Mierzwinski-Urban M. Peer review of literature search strategies: does it make a difference? [internet]. In: Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 21st Cochrane Colloquium; 19.-23.09.2013; Quebec, Canada. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2013-qu%C3%A9bec-city/peer-review-literature-search-strategies-does-it-make-difference>.

106. Thomson Reuters. Endnote [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://endnote.com>.

107. ProQuest. RefWorks [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <https://www.refworks.com/>.

108. Mendeley. Mendeley [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <https://www.mendeley.com>.

109. Kern MK, Hensley MK. Citation management software. Reference and User Services Quarterly 2011; 50(3): 204-208.

110. Gilmour R, Cobus-Kuo L. Reference management software: a comparative analysis of four products. Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship 2011; (66): DOI: 10.5062/F5064Z5060KZF.

111. Lorenzetti DL, Ghali WA. Reference management software for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: an exploration of usage and usability. BMC Med Res Methodol 2013; 13: 141.

112. Hernandez DA, El-Masri MM, Hernandez CA. Choosing and using citation and bibliographic database software (BDS). Diabetes Educ 2008; 34(3): 457-474.

113. Qi X, Yang M, Ren W, Jia J, Wang J, Han G et al. Find duplicates among the PubMed, EMBASE, and Cochrane Library Databases in Systematic Review. PLoS One 2013; 8(8): e71838.

114. Bramer W, Holland L, Mollema J, Hannon T, Bekhuis T. Removing duplicates in retrieval sets from electronic databases [internet]. In: 14th EAHIL 2014 Conference; 11-13 June 2014; Rome, Italy. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://www.iss.it/binary/eahi/cont/57_Bramer_Wichor_slides_EAHIL_2014.pdf.

115. Wolters Kluwer. Ovid database shortnames [internet]. 2014 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://resourcecenter.ovid.com/site/support/ovid_db_shortnames.jsp.

116. Wallace BC, Small K, Brodley CE, Lau J, Trikalinos TA. Deploying an interactive machine learning system in an evidence-based practice center: abstrackr. In: IHI '12 proceedings of the 2nd ACM SIGHIT: International Health Informatics Symposium. New York: Association for Computing Machinery; 2012. p. 819-824.

117. Qatar Computing Research Institute. Rayyan [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://rayyan.qcri.org/>.

118. Alfred Health. Covidence [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.covidence.org>.

119. Higgins JPT, Deeks JJ. Chapter 7: selecting studies and collecting data [internet]. In: Higgins JPT, Green S. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of interventions: version 5.1.0. 03.2011 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://handbook.cochrane.org>.

120. O'Mara-Eves A, Thomas J, McNaught J, Miwa M, Ananiadou S. Using text mining for study identification in systematic reviews: a systematic review of current approaches. *Syst Rev* 2015; 4: 5.
121. Booth A, Papaioannou D, Sutton A. *Systematic approaches to a successful literature review* London: Sage; 2012.
122. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, Mulrow C, Gotzsche PC, Ioannidis JP et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ* 2009; 339: b2700.
123. Mullins MM, DeLuca JB, Crepaz N, Lyles CM. Reporting quality of search methods in systematic reviews of HIV behavioral interventions (2000-2010): are the searches clearly explained, systematic and reproducible? *Res Syn Meth* 2013; 5(2): 116-130.
124. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA Statement. *PLoS Med* 2009; 6(7): e1000097.
125. Shea BJ, Grimshaw JM, Wells GA, Boers M, Andersson N, Hamel C et al. Development of AMSTAR: a measurement tool to assess the methodological quality of systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2007; 7: 10.
126. Shojania KG, Sampson M, Ansari MT, Ji J, Garritty C, Doucette S et al. Updating systematic reviews: AHRQ publication no 07-0087 [internet]. 09.2007 [cited: 22.12.2016]. (AHRQ Technical Reviews; volume 16). Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK44099/pdf/TOC.pdf>.
127. Shojania KG, Sampson M, Ansari MT, Ji J, Doucette S, Moher D. How quickly do systematic reviews go out of date? A survival analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2007; 147(4): 224-233.
128. Sampson M, Shojania KG, Garritty C, Horsley T, Ocampo M, Moher D. Systematic reviews can be produced and published faster. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2008; 61(6): 531-536.
129. Sampson M. Leverage your evidence: analyze the evidence base of your systematic review to inform the update search [internet]. In: *Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 17th Cochrane Colloquium*; 11.-14.10.2009; Singapore. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2009-singapore/leverage-your-evidence-analyze-evidence-base-your-systematic-review-inform-update>.
130. Bergerhoff K, Ebrahim S, Paletta G. Fishing for citations: catching them all? Do we need to consider 'In Process Citations' for search strategies? [internet]. In: *Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 12th Cochrane Colloquium*; 02.-06.10.2004; Ottawa, Canada. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2004-ottawa/do-we-need-consider-process-citations-search-strategies>.
131. Hausner E. Update searches in Ovid [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://medhealth.leeds.ac.uk/download/1019/mmc_search_updates_in_ovid_by_hausner.
132. De Angelis CD, Drazen JM, Frizelle FA, Haug C, Hoey J, Horton R et al. Is this clinical trial fully registered? A statement from the International Committee of Medical Journal Editors. *Ann Intern Med* 2005; 143(2): 146-148.
133. Food and Drug Administration. Food and Drug Administration Amendments Act of 2007: public law 110-85 [internet]. 27.09.2007 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/PLAW-110publ85/pdf/PLAW-110publ85.pdf>.

134. European Medicines Agency. EU Clinical Trials Register [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <https://www.clinicaltrialsregister.eu/ctr-search/search>.
135. European Medicines Agency. Posting of clinical trial summary results in European Clinical Trials Database (EudraCT) to become mandatory for sponsors as of 21 July 2014 [internet]. 19.06.2014 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://www.ema.europa.eu/ema/index.jsp?curl=pages/news_and_events/news/2014/06/news_detail_002127.jsp&mid=WC0b01ac058004d5c1.
136. Korevaar DA, Bossuyt PM, Hooft L. Infrequent and incomplete registration of test accuracy studies: analysis of recent study reports. *BMJ Open* 2014; 4(1): e004596.
137. Institut für Qualität und Wirtschaftlichkeit im Gesundheitswesen. Suchen in Studienregistern nach Studien zu neu zugelassenen Arzneimitteln: Arbeitspapier; Auftrag GA14-01 [internet]. 03.02.2016 [cited: 22.12.2016]. (IQWiG-Berichte; volume 361). Available from: https://www.iqwig.de/download/GA14-01_Arbeitspapier_Suchen-in-Studienregistern-nach-Studien-zu-neu-zugelassenen-Arzneimitteln.pdf.
138. Miller JE, Korn D, Ross JS. Clinical trial registration, reporting, publication and FDAAA compliance: a cross-sectional analysis and ranking of new drugs approved by the FDA in 2012. *BMJ Open* 2015; 5(11): e009758.
139. World Health Organization. International Clinical Trials Search Portal [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://apps.who.int/trialsearch>.
140. Deutsches Cochrane-Zentrum, Studienzentrum des Universitätsklinikums Freiburg. Internetportal des Deutschen Registers Klinischer Studien (DRKS) [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: https://drks-neu.uniklinik-freiburg.de/drks_web.
141. Dutch Cochrane Center. Nederlands Trial Register [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.trialregister.nl/trialreg/index.asp>.
142. U.S. National Library of Medicine. ClinicalTrials.gov [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://clinicaltrials.gov>.
143. Deutsches Institut für Medizinische Dokumentation und Information. PharmNet.Bund: Arzneimittel-Informationssystem [internet]. 27.05.2013 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.pharmnet-bund.de/dynamic/de/am-info-system/index.html>.
144. GlaxoSmithKline. GSK Clinical Study Register [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.gsk-clinicalstudyregister.com>.
145. Forest Laboratories. Forest Laboratories Clinical Trials Registry [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.forestclinicaltrials.com>.
146. Cochrane Dementia and Cognitive Improvement Group. ALOIS: a comprehensive register of dementia studies [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.medicine.ox.ac.uk/alouis>.
147. Chan AW. Out of sight but not out of mind: how to search for unpublished clinical trial evidence. *BMJ* 2012; 344: d8013.
148. Ramagopalan SV, Skingsley AP, Handunnetthi L, Magnus D, Klingel M, Pakpoor J et al. Funding source and primary outcome changes in clinical trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov are associated with the reporting of a statistically significant primary outcome: a cross-sectional study. *F1000Res* 2015; 4: 80.

149. Ramagopalan S, Skingsley AP, Handunnetthi L, Klingel M, Magnus D, Pakpoor J et al. Prevalence of primary outcome changes in clinical trials registered on ClinicalTrials.gov: a cross-sectional study. *F1000Res* 2014; 3: 77.
150. Chi C. Shall we search all trial registers? A comparative study of the sensitivity of five trial registers used by the Cochrane Skin Group [internet]. In: Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 20th Cochrane Colloquium; 30.09.-03.10.2012; Auckland, New Zealand. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2012-auckland/shall-we-search-all-trial-registers-comparative-study-sensitivity-five-trial-registers>.
151. Dal-Re R, Ross JS, Marusic A. Compliance with prospective trial registration guidance remained low in high-impact journals and has implications for primary endpoint reporting. *J Clin Epidemiol* 25.01.2016 [Epub ahead of print].
152. Boccia S, Rothman KJ, Panic N, Flacco ME, Rosso A, Pastorino R et al. Registration practices for observational studies on ClinicalTrials.gov indicated low adherence. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2016; 70: 176-182.
153. Smail-Faugeron V, Fron-Chabouis H, Durieux P. Clinical trial registration in oral health journals. *J Dent Res* 2015; 94(3 Suppl): 8S-13S.
154. Veitch E. Silent takedown of the pharma trials database...and more [internet]. In: PLOS Medical Journals' Community Blog. 23.03.2012 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://blogs.plos.org/speakingofmedicine/2012/03/23/silent-takedown-of-the-pharma-trials-database%E2%80%A6and-more>.
155. International Federation of Pharmaceutical Manufacturers & Associations. IFPMA Clinical Trials Portal discontinued, visitors will be re-directed to the WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform [internet]. [cited: 15.07.2014]. Available from: <http://www.ifpma.org/ethics/clinical-trials-disclosure.html>.
156. Van Enst WA, Scholten RJ, Hooft L. Identification of additional trials in prospective trial registers for Cochrane systematic reviews. *PLoS One* 2012; 7(8): e42812.
157. Jones CW, Keil LG, Weaver MA, Platts-Mills TF. Clinical trials registries are under-utilized in the conduct of systematic reviews: a cross-sectional analysis. *Syst Rev* 2014; 3: 126.
158. Keil LG, Platts-Mills TF, Jones CW. Systematic reviews published in emergency medicine journals do not routinely search clinical trials registries: a cross-sectional analysis. *Ann Emerg Med* 2015; 66(4): 424-427.e2.
159. Potthast R, Vervölgyi V, McGauran N, Kerekes MF, Wieseler B, Kaiser T. Impact of inclusion of industry trial results registries as an information source for systematic reviews. *PLoS One* 2014; 9(4): e92067.
160. Glanville J, Duffy S, McCool R, Varley D. Searching ClinicalTrials.gov and the International Clinical Trials Registry Platform to inform systematic reviews: what are the optimal search approaches? *J Med Libr Assoc* 2014; 102(3): 177-183.
161. Tai FM, Willson ML, Ghersi D. Implications of searching multiple trial registries: how should we search ClinicalTrials.gov and WHO ICTRP? [internet]. In: Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 20th Cochrane Colloquium; 30.09.-03.10.2012; Auckland, New Zealand. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2012-auckland/implications-searching-multiple-trial-registries-how-should-we-search>.

162. Hardt JL, Metzendorf MI, Meerpohl JJ. Surgical trials and trial registers: a cross-sectional study of randomized controlled trials published in journals requiring trial registration in the author instructions. *Trials* 2013; 14: 407.
163. Hausner E. Problems encountered with ICTRP Search Portal; Comment on: "Van Enst WA, Scholten RJ, Hooft L. Identification of additional trials in prospective trial registers for Cochrane systematic reviews (PLoS One 2012; 7(8): e42812)." [internet]. 23.07.2014 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.plosone.org/annotation/listThread.action?root=81099>.
164. Hausner E, Kaiser T. Suche in Studienregistern: Ablauf und Dokumentation. *Z Evid Fortbild Qual Gesundheitswes* 2010; 104(4): 292-297.
165. Menezes AS, Barnes A, Scheer AS, Martel G, Moloo H, Boushey RP et al. Clinical research in surgical oncology: an analysis of ClinicalTrials.gov. *Ann Surg Oncol* 2013; 20(12): 3725-3731.
166. York Health Economics Consortium. Finding clinical trials, research registers and research results [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <https://sites.google.com/a/york.ac.uk/yhectrialsregisters>.
167. Cochrane Information Retrieval Methods Group. Filters for reference management software [internet]. 01.03.2013 [cited: 27.06.2014]. Available from: <http://irmg.cochrane.org/filters-reference-management-software>.
168. Ko H, Tai F, Ghera D, Askie L. Inconsistent quality of reporting of searching clinical trials registries in Cochrane systematic reviews and protocols [internet]. In: Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 19th Cochrane Colloquium; 19.-22.10.2011; Madrid, Spain. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2011-madrid/inconsistent-quality-reporting-searching-clinical-trials-registries-cochrane-systematic>.
169. Wieseler B, Wolfram N, McGauran N, Kerekes MF, Vervölgyi V, Kohlepp P et al. Completeness of reporting of patient-relevant clinical trial outcomes: comparison of unpublished clinical study reports with publicly available data. *PLoS Med* 2013; 10(10): e1001526.
170. Doshi P, Jefferson T, Del Mar C. The imperative to share clinical study reports: recommendations from the Tamiflu experience. *PLoS Med* 2012; 9(4): e1001201.
171. Doshi P, Jefferson T. Clinical study reports of randomised controlled trials: an exploratory review of previously confidential industry reports. *BMJ Open* 2013; 3(2): e002496.
172. Jefferson T, Jones MA, Doshi P, Del Mar CB, Hama R, Thompson MJ et al. Neuraminidase inhibitors for preventing and treating influenza in healthy adults and children. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2014; (4): CD008965.
173. European Parliament, Council Of The European Union. Regulation (EU) No 536/2014 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 16 April 2014 on clinical trials on medicinal products for human use, and repealing Directive 2001/20/EC. *Official Journal of the European Union* 2014; L158(1): 1-76.
174. Eichler HG, Abadie E, Breckenridge A, Leufkens H, Rasi G. Open clinical trial data for all? A view from regulators. *PLoS Med* 2012; 9(4): e1001202.
175. Torjesen I. European drug agency backtracks on plan to give researchers access to clinical trial reports. *BMJ* 2014; 348: g3432.

176. Wieseler B, McGauran N, Kaiser T. EMA's transparency policy: a placebo intervention? Comment on: "Torjesen I. European drug agency backtracks on plan to give researchers access to clinical trial reports (BMJ 2014; 348: g3432)" [internet]. 23.05.2014 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.bmj.com/content/348/bmj.g3432/rr/699175>.
177. GlaxoSmithKline. Clinical study report compounds [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.gsk-clinicalstudyregister.com/compounds/a-f/clinicalstudyreport>.
178. Clinical Study Data Request. ClinicalStudyDataRequest.com [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: www.clinicalstudydatarequest.com.
179. Mayo-Wilson E, Doshi P, Dickersin K. Are manufacturers sharing data as promised? BMJ 2015; 351: h4169.
180. Institute for Quality and Efficiency in Health Care. General methods: version 4.1 [internet]. 28.11.2013 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: https://www.iqwig.de/download/IQWiG_General_Methods_Version_%204-1.pdf.
181. Jefferson T, Doshi P, Thompson M, Heneghan C. Ensuring safe and effective drugs: who can do what it takes? BMJ 2011; 342: c7258.
182. McDonagh MS, Peterson K, Balshem H, Helfand M. US Food and Drug Administration documents can provide unpublished evidence relevant to systematic reviews. J Clin Epidemiol 2013; 66(10): 1071-1081.
183. Schroll JB, Bero L, Gøtzsche PC. Searching for unpublished data for Cochrane reviews: cross sectional study. BMJ 2013; 346: f2231.
184. European Medicines Agency. Webauftritt [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.ema.europa.eu>.
185. Food and Drug Administration. Drugs@FDA [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cder/daf/>.
186. European Commission. European Databank on Medical Devices: EUDAMED [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://ec.europa.eu/health/medical-devices/market-surveillance-vigilance/eudamed/index_en.htm.
187. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Find guidance [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance>.
188. Food and Drug Administration. Devices@FDA [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.accessdata.fda.gov/scripts/cdrh/devicesatfda/index.cfm>.
189. Health Canada. Summary basis of decision [internet]. 27.02.2014 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.hc-sc.gc.ca/dhp-mps/prodpharma/sbd-smd/index-eng.php>.
190. Pharmaceuticals and Medical Devices Agency Japan. Approved products [internet]. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://www.pmda.go.jp/english/service/approved.html>.
191. Turner EH. How to access and process FDA drug approval packages for use in research. BMJ 2013; 347: f5992.
192. Schroll JB, Abdel-Sattar M, Bero L. The Food and Drug Administration reports provided more data but were more difficult to use than the European Medicines Agency reports. J Clin Epidemiol 2015; 68(1): 102-107.
193. Mullan RJ, Flynn DN, Carlberg B, Tleyjeh IM, Kamath CC, LaBella ML et al. Systematic reviewers commonly contact study authors but do so with limited rigor. J Clin Epidemiol 2009; 62(2): 138-142.

194. Young T, Hopewell S. Methods for obtaining unpublished data. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2011; (11): MR000027.
195. Hinde S, Spackman E. Bidirectional citation searching to completion: an exploration of literature searching methods. *Pharmacoeconomics* 2015; 33(1): 5-11.
196. Dorée C, Hausner E, Mathisen M, Waffenschmidt S. Value of using different search approaches [internet]. 08.03.2016 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://vortal.htai.org/?q=node/993>.
197. Linder SK, Kamath GR, Pratt GF, Saraykar SS, Volk RJ. Citation searches are more sensitive than keyword searches to identify studies using specific measurement instruments. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2015; 68(4): 412-417.
198. Feehan LM, Beck CA, Harris SR, MacIntyre DL, Li LC. Exercise prescription after fragility fracture in older adults: a scoping review. *Osteoporos Int* 2011; 22(5): 1289-1322.
199. Atkinson KM, Koenka AC, Sanchez CE, Moshontz H, Cooper H. Reporting standards for literature searches and report inclusion criteria: making research syntheses more transparent and easy to replicate. *Res Syn Meth* 2015; 6(1): 87-95.
200. Dundar Y, Dodd S, Dickson R, Walley T, Haycox A, Williamson P. Comparison of conference abstracts and presentations with full-text articles in the health technology assessments of rapidly evolving technologies. *Health Technol Assess* 2006; 10(5): iii-iv, ix-145.
201. Toma M, McAlister FA, Bialy L, Adams D, Vandermeer B, Armstrong PW. Transition from meeting abstract to full-length journal article for randomized controlled trials. *JAMA* 2006; 295(11): 1281-1287.
202. Wright JM, Cottrell DJ, Mir G. Searching for religion and mental health studies required health, social science, and grey literature databases. *J Clin Epidemiol* 2014; 67(7): 800-810.
203. Vickers AJ, Smith C. Incorporating data from dissertations in systematic reviews. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2000; 16(2): 711-713.
204. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. *JAMA* 2000; 283(15): 2008-2012.
205. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials: the QUOROM statement. *Lancet* 1999; 354(9193): 1896-1900.
206. INHATA. A checklist for health technology assessment reports: version 3.2 [internet]. 08.2007 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: http://www.inahta.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/04/INAHTA_HTA_Checklist_English.pdf.
207. Hammerstrøm K, Wade A, Klint Jørgensen AM. Searching for studies: a guide to information retrieval for Campbell Systematic Reviews [internet]. 19.08.2010 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://campbellcollaboration.org/lib/download/969>.
208. Booth A. "Brimful of STARLITE": toward standards for reporting literature searches. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2006; 94(4): 421-429, e205.
209. Cosford PA, Leng GC. Screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2007; (2): CD002945.

210. Agenzia Nazionale per i Servizi Sanitari Regionali. Abdominal aorta aneurysm screening [internet]. In: HTA Core Model Online. 31.01.2013 [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://mekat.thl.fi/htacore/106.aspx>.
211. Takagi H, Goto SN, Matsui M, Manabe H, Umemoto T. A further meta-analysis of population-based screening for abdominal aortic aneurysm. *J Vasc Surg* 2010; 52(4): 1103-1108.
212. Wong SSL, Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Comparison of top-performing search strategies for detecting clinically sound treatment studies and systematic reviews in MEDLINE and EMBASE. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2006; 94(4): 451-455.
213. Hausner E, Ebrahim S, Herrmann-Frank A, Janzen T, Kerekes MF, Pischedda M et al. Study selection by means of a web-based Trial Selection DataBase (webTSDB) [internet]. In: Cochrane Colloquium Abstracts: 19th Cochrane Colloquium; 19.-22.10.2011; Madrid, Spain. [cited: 22.12.2016]. Available from: <http://abstracts.cochrane.org/2011-madrid/study-selection-means-web-based-trial-selection-database-webtsdb>.

Annexe 2. Documentation of the literature search

The internal IQWiG database includes literature retrieved from

1) Literature monitoring via AutoAlert in MEDLINE (Ovid)

Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily and Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to Present

#	Searches
1	(Semi-automated or data mining or (Capture adj3 recapture) or machine learning).ab,ti.
2	(search adj3 (strateg* or term* or filter*)).ab,ti.
3	(query or queries).ab,ti.
4	search*.ti.
5	or/1-4
6	exp "Information Storage and Retrieval"/
7	"Medical Subject Headings"/
8	"Abstracting and Indexing as Topic"/
9	Documentation/
10	reporting.ab,ti.
11	(bibliographic databas* or Pubmed).ab,ti.
12	(MeSH or controlled vocabulary or indexing).ab,ti.
13	or/6-12
14	"Review Literature as Topic"/
15	exp "Evidence-Based Practice"/
16	"Technology Assessment, Biomedical"/
17	or/14-16
18	and/5,13,17
19	exp *"Information Storage and Retrieval"/
20	4 and (16 or 19)
21	(Medline or PubMed).ti.
22	(Clinical Queries or Haynes or hedge or search).ti,ab.
23	and/21-22
24	or/18,20,23

Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily and Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to Present

#	Searches
1	exp Databases, Bibliographic/
2	(medline* or pubmed* or embase* or cochrane* or cinahl* or psycinfo* or amed* or google* or pedro*).ti.
3	1 or 2
4	exp *"Information Storage and Retrieval"/
5	(systematic and search*).ab,ti.
6	or/4-5
7	review*.ab,ti.
8	Review Literature as Topic/
9	Meta-Analysis as Topic/
10	Evidence-Based Medicine/
11	*Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic/
12	or/7-11
13	and/3,6,12

Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations, Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily and Ovid MEDLINE(R) 1946 to Present

#	Searches
1	clinicaltrials*.ti.
2	unpublished.ti.
3	(handsearch* or hand search* or reference list*).ti.
4	((full or abstract or bias) adj3 publication).ti.
5	or/1-4
6	Registries/
7	*Databases, Factual/
8	(clinicaltrials* or trial* registr* or ICTRP or European Medicines Agency).ti,ab.
9	6 or 7 or 8
10	Clinical Trials as Topic/
11	*Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic/
12	9 and (10 or 11)
13	5 or 12

Screening of the reference lists of relevant articles

2) Screening of literature identified elsewhere

Searches to identify additional references on "Queries to authors", "Conference abstracts", and "Reference lists of publications"

Cochrane Library (Wiley)

Search date: 21.08.14

#	Searches
1	reference next list*:ti or (conference next (proceeding* or abstract*)):ti or (author* near (quer* or contact*)):ti (Word variations have been searched)
2	systematic next review*:ti or (health next technology next assessment*) or HTA:ti or evidence next synthes*:ti (Word variations have been searched)
3	#1 and #2

PubMed (NLM)

Search date: 21.08.14

(((systematic review*[Title]) OR health technology assessment*[Title]) OR HTA[Title])) AND (((reference list*[Title]) OR conference proceeding*[Title]) OR conference abstract*[Title]) OR author*[Title])
--

Annexe 3. Common reporting elements

Common reporting elements of the analysis of Mullins et al. [123]:

- Databases [5,23,25,124,125,204-208]
- Name of Interface (host/platform) [5,25,124,204,208]
- Years covered by search [5,23,25,124,125,204-208]
- Date last search was run [5,23,25,124,207]
- Complete search strategy [5,23,25,124,125,204,206-208]
- Language limits [23,124,125,204-208]
- Supplemental search [5,23,25,124,125,204,205,207,208]
- Qualification of searcher [25,204]

Annexe 4. Example: Ultrasound screening for abdominal aortic aneurysms

The present example refers to the assessment of the benefit of ultrasound screening for abdominal aortic aneurysms. For this purpose a systematic search for RCTs was conducted. The aim of the example is to give a quick impression of how to perform a systematic search in bibliographic databases and study registries.

Implementation of the search in bibliographic databases

Conducting preliminary searches *(Back to top)*

At the start of the project – before the development of the actual search strategy – a preliminary search for high-quality systematic reviews on ultrasound screening for abdominal aortic aneurysms was conducted in the Cochrane Library (Wiley).

The search was kept as simple as possible, in the present example for “ultrasound screening” and “abdominal aortic aneurysms”. One Cochrane Review (CD002945 [209]) was identified that precisely covers the research question (Figure 2).




Figure 2: Preliminary search in Cochrane Library (Wiley)

The background section of the Cochrane Review was read to learn more about the topic; more importantly, the primary studies in the review could be used. A search in PubMed and on websites of HTA agencies identified two further systematic reviews [210,211].

The inclusion and exclusion criteria, as well as the information retrieval processes, were assessed to estimate the completeness of the evidence base considered in the systematic reviews identified. The evidence base was assessed to be comprehensive and thus suited to serve as a basis of our search strategy. A total of three systematic reviews and 38 relevant references were available and could be used for the development and validation of our own search strategy.

Structuring the search strategy [\(Back to top\)](#)

Organizing topics into concepts is relatively simple in the present example, as the individual concepts were clearly distinguishable from the inclusion and exclusion criteria of our systematic review.

The search was structured as follows

Concept 1 (indication): abdominal aortic aneurysm

Concept 2 (intervention): ultrasound screening

Concept 3 (study type): RCTs

No further limits were specified.

Choosing information sources [\(Back to top\)](#)

The systematic search was to be conducted in MEDLINE, Embase (via the interface Ovid) and the Cochrane Library (via Wiley). In addition, non-indexed references were directly searched for via PubMed, as Ovid does not fully provide these references.

Other subject-specific or regional databases were not selected.





Name of database	Interface	
MEDLINE	Ovid	 Wolters Kluwer Health OvidSP
Embase	Ovid	 Wolters Kluwer Health OvidSP
Cochrane Library	Wiley	 THE COCHRANE LIBRARY Independent high-quality evidence for health care decision making
Pubmed	NLM	

Table 2: Databases and interfaces

Developing search strategies: Identifying search terms [\(Back to top\)](#)

Objectively-derived approach

In the objectively-derived approach, the relevant references identified in the preliminary search are searched for in bibliographic databases (MEDLINE and Embase) and imported into EndNote. A text analysis is then performed. In the present example, a total of 38 references could be identified in MEDLINE. Two-thirds of these 38 references were used for the development of the search strategy (development set) and one third for the subsequent validation (validation set).

Free-text terms

The Wordstat tool was used for the text analysis of free-text terms [7]. Not only the most common terms were identified, but also those overrepresented in the development set.

The results from Wordstat were exported into Excel and processed; the overrepresented terms were then assigned to the predefined concepts (indication and intervention).

Further, each of these terms was checked to determine whether a further restriction to phrases and word combinations was possible.

The following over-represented terms were identified for concept 1.

Terms		Frequency	
Left	Indication	Hits	Right
abdominal	AORTIC	25	aneurysm/s
	ABDOMINAL	25	aortic aneurysm/s, aorta
abdominal aortic, aortic	ANEURYSM	23	abdominal aorta
abdominal aortic, aortic	ANEURYSMS	15	
abdominal	AORTA	5	

Words commonly occur in this group of words

Figure 3: Common terms for concept 1

The following relevant phrases and word combinations were determined for these terms.

Phrases from Figure 3	Consequences	Example of the search syntax in Ovid
-----------------------	--------------	--------------------------------------

abdominal aortic aneurysm(s)	The words commonly occur in this group of word; the three terms are therefore linked with a proximity operator	abdominal adj1 aortic adj1 aneurysm (preliminary)
abdominal aortic / aorta aneurysm(s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> “Aneurysm” is used both in the singular and plural form: this term is therefore truncated. “Aorta” is also used in addition to “aortic”; the word stem “aort” is thus also truncated. 	abdominal adj1 aort* adj1 aneurysm* (preliminary)
aneurysm of the abdominal aorta	The terms may also be used in a different sequence or with a greater distance between words; the distance to “aneurysm*” is therefore increased	abdominal adj1 aort* adj3 aneurysm* (final)

Table 3: Phrases and consequences for implementation using the example of MEDLINE via OvidSP

Subject headings

Subject headings are identified via EndNote. The subject headings of the references can be listed according to frequency by means of the “Subject Bibliography” function. This list was then exported into Excel and the individual subject headings were sorted according to the predefined concepts (see Figure 4).




Figure 4: Analysis of subject headings in EndNote via the “Subject Bibliography” function

The following subject heading was identified in MEDLINE for concept 1:

Subject heading		Frequency
Indication	Hits	Notes
Aortic Aneurysm, Abdominal	24	No narrower subject headings

Information about „subordinate terms“

Figure 5: Common subject headings for concept 2 using the example of MEDLINE

A MeSH term was identified in Medline for concept 1 that was consistently assigned to all references from the test set. No further MesH terms were therefore required for concept 1. The “explode” function was not used, as there are no subordinate terms for “Aortic Aneurysm, Abdominal”.

The procedure was used in Embase for a separate analysis of EMTREE terms (Embase subject headings). As the Cochrane Library uses MeSH terms, a separate analysis of subject headings was not required for this database, as the subject headings from the MEDLINE strategy were used.

Study filter

A validated study filter was used for the search for RCTs. In the present example, we decided to use the “Cochrane highly sensitive search strategy for identifying randomized trials in MEDLINE: sensitivity-maximizing version” (2008 revision) [3].

Developing search strategies: Adapting the search syntax (database-specific approach) [\(Back to top\)](#)

The search strategy was first developed for MEDLINE (Ovid) and then for other databases. The free-text terms identified could be used across all databases. However, they had to be adapted to the different databases/interfaces. The example in Table 4 shows the proximity operators differ depending on the interface. The subject headings were identified separately for each database (see Table 5).

Our example shows the implementation for concept 1:

Database (interface)	Free-text terms
MEDLINE und Embase (Ovid)	(abdominal adj1 aort* adj3 aneurysm*).ti,ab.
Cochrane (Wiley)	(abdominal NEAR/1 aort* NEAR/3 aneurysm*):ti,ab
PubMed (NLM)	abdominal*[tiab] AND aort*[tiab] AND aneurysm*[tiab]

Table 4: Database- and interface-specific tags for free-text terms

Database (interface)	Subject headings
MEDLINE (Ovid)	Aortic Aneurysm, Abdominal/
Embase (Ovid)	Abdominal Aorta Aneurysm/
Cochrane (Wiley)	MeSH descriptor: [Aortic Aneurysm, Abdominal] this term only
Pubmed (NLM)	No subject headings are used to search for new, non-indexed references (including Epub ahead of print references). Non-indexed references are identified in PubMed via the syntax “#x NOT medline[sb]”.

Table 5: Database- and interface-specific tags for subject headings

The search strategy was organized according to the search concepts used in the individual databases. For each concept, first the subject headings and then the free-text terms were entered. For one concept, all search lines were combined with “OR”; the concepts were then joined together with “AND” (see Table 6).

Our example shows the implementation for MEDLINE:

#	Searches	Results
1	Aortic Aneurysm, Abdominal/	13646
2	(abdominal* adj1 aort* adj3 aneurysm*).ti,ab.	14046
3	or/1-2 [Concept 1]	18402
4	Mass Screening/	83663
5	ultrasonography.fs.	198380
6	screening*.ti,ab.	341139
7	(ultraso* adj3 scan*).ti,ab.	14122
8	or/4-7 [Concept 2]	567366
9	randomized controlled trial.pt.	396032
10	controlled clinical trial.pt.	90636
...		
15	or/ 9-15 [Study filter: RCT]	391739
16	and/3,8,15 [Concept 1 AND Concept 2 AND Study filter]	520

Table 6: Structure of search strategy in MEDLINE (Ovid)

Before running any searches, a second person was asked to peer review the search strategies.

Peer reviewing search strategies ([Back to top](#))

Peer reviewing of the draft search strategy was performed in 2 steps:

Application of the PRESS checklist: The search strategy was checked for errors by a second person using the PRESS checklist (see Table 7). For the process of text analysis, questions 3 and 4 were checked by means of the internal documentation on the text analysis.

Element	Questions
Translation of the research question	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the search strategy match the research question/PICO?• Are the search concepts clear?• Are there too many or too few PICO elements included?• Are the search concepts too narrow or too broad?• Does the search retrieve too many or too few records? (Please show number of hits per line.)• Are unconventional or complex strategies explained?
Boolean and proximity operators (these vary based on search service)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are Boolean or proximity operators used correctly?• Is the use of nesting with brackets appropriate and effective for the search?• If NOT is used, is this likely to result in any unintended exclusions?• Could precision be improved by using proximity operators (e.g., adjacent, near, within) or phrase-searching instead of AND?• Is the width of proximity operators suitable (e.g., might adj5 pick up more variants than adj2)?
Subject headings (database-specific)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Are the subject headings relevant?• Are any relevant subject headings missing; e.g., previous index terms?• Are any subject headings too broad or too narrow?• Are subject headings exploded where necessary and vice versa?• Are major headings ("starring" or restrict to focus) used? If so, is there adequate justification?• Are subheadings missing?• Are subheadings attached to subject headings? (Floating subheadings may be preferred.)• Are floating subheadings relevant and used appropriately?• Are both subject headings and terms in free text (see below) used for each concept?
Text word searching (free text)	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Does the search include all spelling variants in free text (e.g., UK versus US spelling)?• Does the search include all synonyms or antonyms (e.g., opposites)?• Does the search capture relevant truncation (i.e., is truncation at the correct place)?• Is the truncation too broad or too narrow?• Are acronyms or abbreviations used appropriately? Do they capture irrelevant material? Are the full terms also included?• Are the keywords specific enough or too broad? Are too many or too few keywords used? Are stop words used?• Have the appropriate fields been searched; e.g., is the choice of the text word fields (.tw.) or all fields (.af.) appropriate? Are there any other fields to be included or excluded (database-specific)?• Should any long strings be broken into several shorter search statements?

Spelling, syntax and line numbers

- Are there any spelling errors?
- Are there any errors in system syntax; e.g., the use of a truncation symbol from a different search interface?
- Are there incorrect line combinations or orphan lines (i.e., lines that are not referred to in the final summation that could indicate an error in an AND or OR statement)?

Limits and filters

- Are all limits and filters used appropriately and are they relevant given the research question?
- Are all limits and filters used appropriately and are they relevant for the database?
- Are any potentially helpful limits or filters missing? Are the limits or filters too broad or too narrow? Can any limits or filters be added or taken away?
- Are sources cited for the filters used?

Table 7: PRESS 2015 Evidence-based Checklist (Table 9 in [27])

Check for completeness: It was also assessed whether the draft of the search strategy identifies all references of the validation set (VS). For this purpose a search string was created using the accession numbers of the respective references. The search strategy was checked against the validation set in order to see if it was able to capture all the references included in this set (see Figure 6).

In the present example, one reference was not found with the selected study filter. As no other validated study filter would have found this reference either (HIRU Clinical Queries filters – High sensitivity strategy [98,212], Cochrane Highly Sensitive Search Strategy for identifying randomized trials in MEDLINE: sensitivity- and precision-maximizing version (2008 revision) [3]), the study filter was not changed.

<input type="checkbox"/>	16	14 not 15 [CHSS - sensitivity-maximizing version]	2903085	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	17	meta analysis.mp.pt.	80620	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	18	search*.tw.	247360	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	19	review.pt.	1905103	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	20	or/17-19 [Wong - Strategy minimizing difference between sensitivity and specificity]	2101835	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	21	or/16,20	4602378	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	22	and/9,21	538	Number of hits		
<input type="checkbox"/>	23	("17514666" or "7497157" or "17443519" or "11336846" or "10392481" or "11748949" or "16893663" or "10375481" or "15545293" or "7648155" or "11202589" or "10321373" or "10671927").ui. [Validation Set]	14	Advanced	Display	More >>
<input type="checkbox"/>	24	22 and 23	13	Validation set		
<input type="checkbox"/>	25	23 not 24	1	Identified references from validation set		
References not identified from validation set			1	More >>		

Figure 6: Validation set

Copyright © EUnetHTA 2016. All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced without an explicit acknowledgement of the source and EUnetHTA's expressed consent

Conducting searches, downloading records, and managing references ([Back to top](#))

After implementation of the comments on quality assurance, the preparations were completed. The final, saved search strategies could be applied. PubMed was searched for non-indexed references followed by MEDLINE, Embase and the Cochrane Library.

The text files with the references were designated in a standardized manner: date of search, name of project and database (e.g. 2015-07-09_S1555_Medline.txt) and the references then imported to EndNote. The duplicates were then removed in a multi-step procedure.

For this purpose, first the automatic “find duplicates” function in EndNote was used. The references were sorted according to author and title, and the list was manually checked for duplicates. The references were then processed for screening.

Screening citations (technical process) ([Back to top](#))

In a 2-step procedure the references were screened and assessed by two reviewers independently of one another. IQWiG’s own screening tool was used for this purpose (webTSDb; [213]). In the first screening step, 623 of the 703 references could be excluded on the abstract and title level, and 80 references were assessed for relevance in full texts. A total of 20 relevant publications based on 4 studies were identified.

Documenting and reporting the search process ([Back to top](#))

Internal documentation

The whole conduct of the search was documented in real time. The search strategies and the number of hits were saved in Word (see Figure 7), and the references were saved as text files (see Figure 8). In addition, a table was created including the search dates, search interfaces, the database segments, as well as the results of the duplicate check (see Table 8).




Figure 7: Documentation of the search strategies in the individual bibliographic databases




Figure 8: Documentation of the references in the individual bibliographic databases (as text files)

Database (Provider)	Database segment	Date	Hits
MEDLINE (Ovid)	Ovid MEDLINE (R)1946 to November Week 3		
	2013, Ovid MEDLINE (R) Daily Update		
	November 20, 2013, Ovid MEDLINE (R) In-	06.01.2014	491
	Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations		
Embase (Ovid)	Embase 1974 to 2014 January 03	06.01.2014	326
...
Total hits			951
Duplicates			249
Hits without duplicates			702

Table 8: Documentation of the search process in Excel

Reporting

All databases searched were listed in the methods section of the report, as well as the date of the last search. The search strategies for all databases, the database segments, and the interfaces used were presented in the appendix of the report (see Figure 9).

MEDLINE Search interface: Ovid		Database and interface	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ovid MEDLINE(R)1946 to January Week 1 2014 • Ovid MEDLINE(R) Daily Update January 14, 2014 • Ovid MEDLINE(R) In-Process & Other Non-Indexed Citations January 14, 2014 			Database segment
Search filters used: Systematic review: Wong – Strategy minimizing difference between sensitivity and specificity; RCT: Lefebvre – Cochrane Highly Sensitive Search Strategy for identifying randomized trials in MEDLINE: sensitivity-maximizing version (2008 revision)			Search filter
#	Searches		
1	Aortic Aneurysm, Abdominal/		
2	(abdominal* adj1 aort* adj3 aneurysm*).ti,ab.		
3	or/1-2		
4	Mass Screening/		
5	ultrasonography.fs.		
6	screening*.ti,ab.		
7	(ultraso* adj3 scan*).ti,ab.		
8	or/4-7		
9	and/3,8		Search Strategy
10	randomized controlled trial.pt.		
11	controlled clinical trial.pt.		
12	(randomized or placebo or randomly or trial or groups).ab.		
13	drug therapy.fs.		
14	or/10-13		
15	(animals not (humans and animals)).sh.		
16	14 not 15		
17	meta analysis.mp,pt.		
18	search*.tw.		
19	review.pt.		
20	or/17-19		
21	or/16,20		
22	and/9,21		

Figure 9: Reporting of the search strategy of the report using the example of MEDLINE

The results of the search, the check for duplicates, and the selection of studies following PRISMA [122] were presented in the results section of the report (see Figure 10).




Figure 10: Flowchart for bibliographic database search in the results section of the report

In addition, the report contains the citations of all included studies and all excluded studies, together with the reasons for exclusion, (see Figure 11 and Figure 12).




Figure 11: Reporting of included studies in the HTA report




Figure 12: Reporting of excluded studies in the HTA report

Updating searches *(Back to top)*

Since the report was published after January 2015 (12 months after the initial search), an update search was performed.

The procedure was as follows: First, we checked in which databases the 20 relevant publications were found and whether they could be identified with the search strategies. It was checked whether, for instance, references contained in MEDLINE could be identified with the MEDLINE strategy. Any changes in subject headings of the individual databases were also considered.

To remove the duplicates of the initial search from the update search, a search string was created in MEDLINE, Embase and PubMed using all accession numbers of the respective references from the initial search. This search string and the search strategy were linked with “NOT” to obtain the results of the update search (Figure 13). In the Cochrane Library, this approach is only possible for references from MEDLINE and Embase. The remaining duplicates were then removed in EndNote.

The further search process followed the standards in “Conducting searches, downloading records and managing references” (see 2.4.6).

The combined results of the initial and update search were presented in the report.

21	or/16,20	4649590	Advanced	Display
22	and/9,21	544	Advanced	Display
23	("1913408" or "1481294" or "8093508" or "7664011" or "9853437" or "9853436" or "10873733" or "21130969" or "21086623" or "16890847" or "22163325" or "20478680" or "16996941" or "3066407" or "8634854" or "8379351" or "9345237" or "16467752" or "21810825" or "7936338" or "1925354" or "1829179" or "21236619" or "23260442" or "15185182" or "12514572" or "11718410" or "15176708" or "10541616" or "15943504" or "12443589" or "17514666" or "16293428" or "2200328" or "18082528" or "14677480" or "22231532" or "8021114" or "17303997" or "21485471" or "11496273" or "16881275" or "15886653" or "15354629" or "18575030" or "21043165" or "21622013" or "9234101" or "9034919" or "20570470" or "9854557" or "9501808" or "17152201" or "23692903" or "15943501" or "9711956" or "23602862" or "7494369" or "17145427" or "17180573" or "10828236").ul.	513	Advanced	Display
24	22 not 23	31	Advanced	Display

Annotations:

- Update search (points to row 22)
- Initial search (January 2014) (points to row 23)
- New added references (points to row 24)

Figure 13: Result of the update search

Implementation of the search in study registries

A search in study registries was conducted to search for published or ongoing studies.

Structuring the search strategy ([Back to top](#))

Since study registries have limited search functions, only the following 2 concepts were searched.

Concept 1 (indication): abdominal aortic aneurysm

Concept 2 (intervention): screening, scan

The term “ultrasound” was not included in the search - in contrast to the search strategy in bibliographic databases. No limitation on the type of study was applied.

Choosing information sources ([Back to top](#))

The systematic search in study registries was to be conducted in ClinicalTrials.gov, EU Clinical Trials Register and the ICTRP Search Portal. Other topic- or disease-specific study registries were not selected.

Study registries	
ClinicalTrials.gov	
ICTRP Search Portal	
EU Clinical Trials Register	

Table 9: Study registries

Developing search strategies: Identifying search terms ([Back to top](#))

The results of the text analysis in bibliographical databases were used for the development of the search strategies. For ClinicalTrials.gov and ICTRP Search Portal, the selection of search terms was matched with the registry-specific synonym search.

For concept 1 (“abdominal aortic aneurysm”) ClinicalTrials.gov synonyms corresponded with the identified terms in the text analysis (see Figure 14). No further adjustment was therefore necessary.




Figure 14: Synonyms for “abdominal aortic aneurysm” using the example of ClinicalTrials.gov

The synonym search of “screening” did not cover all terms from the text analysis. The term “scan” was therefore added to the search (see Figure 15).




Figure 15: Synonyms for “screening OR scan” using the example of ClinicalTrials.gov

In ICTRP Search portal and in the EU Clinical Trials Register, the synonyms were examined indirectly. For this purpose, the search strategy for ClinicalTrials.gov was extended and adjusted if the number of hits changed. In our example, however, no changes in the strategy were necessary.

Developing search strategies: Adapting the search syntax [\(Back to top\)](#)

The terms identified were entered in the different registries using registry-specific search functions. The search can be structured by using brackets in ClinicalTrials.gov and the EU Clinical Trials Register, but not in ICTRP Search Portal. In addition, Boolean operators should always be written in uppercase. Truncation was not used, as this feature turns off the synonym search or is not possible (e.g. in ClinicalTrials.gov).

Study registry	Search syntax	Comment
ClinicalTrials.gov	abdominal aortic aneurysm AND (screening OR scan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brackets can be used in this registry
ICTRP Search Portal	abdominal aortic aneurysm AND screening OR abdominal aortic aneurysm AND scan ²	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Use of brackets not possible
EU Clinical Trials Register	abdominal aortic aneurysm AND (screening OR scan)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Brackets can be used in this registry

Table 10: Adapting the search syntax in each study registry

Peer reviewing search strategies³ [\(Back to top\)](#)

Peer reviewing of the draft search strategy was performed by a second person. It was checked whether the search strategies included all terms from the text analysis or were covered by the synonym search in the study registries.

Conducting searches, downloading records and managing references [\(Back to top\)](#)

After implementation of the comments on quality assurance, the preparations were completed and the final search strategies applied. Direct export of the results as xml or txt file is offered for all 3 study registries (see Figure 16).

² In the report, 2 separate search steps were undertaken to enter the syntax and the duplicates removed in EndNote. The search above yields the same results but is more convenient.

³ The process of quality assurance of search strategies in study registries has recently been revised. Therefore the example does not show the current status.




Figure 16: Export function using the example of ClinicalTrials.gov

These files were then imported in EndNote using an import filter. The duplicates were removed based on the registry numbers (see Figure 17).




Figure 17: Result of the search in study registries after import into EndNote

Copyright © EUnetHTA 2016. All Rights Reserved. No part of this document may be reproduced without an explicit acknowledgement of the source and EUnetHTA's expressed consent

Screening citations (technical process) *(Back to top)*

In a 1-step procedure the references were screened and assessed by two reviewers independently of one another. IQWiG's own screening tool was used for this purpose (webTSDB).

67 studies were assessed for relevance; a total of 3 completed studies and 2 ongoing studies were identified.

Documenting and reporting the search process *(Back to top)*

Internal documentation

Documentation was performed throughout the process. The xml and txt files were saved. (see Figure 18).

Figure 18: Screenshots of search results in study registries

The search strategies, the number of hits, the search date and the duplicate check were saved for all study registries in EXCEL (see Figure 19).

Studienregister generieren	
Clinicaltrials.gov	Number of hits
Search syntax	abdominal aortic aneurysm AND (screening OR scan)
Number of hits	45
Relevant hits	45
Reason for exclusion:	
Date of search	15.01.2014
Name of screenshots	2014-01-15_S13-04_CT.gov_1, 2014-01-15_S13-04_CT.gov_2, 2014-01-15_S13-04_CT.gov_3

EU-CTR	
Search syntax	abdominal aortic aneurysm AND (screening OR scan)
Number of hits	17
Relevant hits	17
Reason for exclusion:	
Date of search	15.01.2014
Name of screenshots	2014-01-15_S13-04_EU-CTR

Figure 19: Documentation of the search in study registries

Reporting

All study registries searched were listed in the methods section of the report.

All completed and ongoing studies, together with the study registry ID, study name, citation, and information on whether the results of the study are available in the study registry, were presented in the results section of the report (see Figure 20).

Table 5: Relevant studies identified in study registries

Study registry ID	Study name	Study registry [Citation]	Results of the study available
ISRCTN00079388	Chichester	ISRCTN [30]	No
ISRCTN65822028	Viborg	ISRCTN [42]	No
ISRCTN16171472	Western Australian	ISRCTN [53]	No
ISRCTN37381646	MASS	ISRCTN [54]	No

Completed studies

Table 6: Studies of unknown relevance identified in study registries

Study registry ID	Study name	Study registry [Citation]	Status	Results of the study available
NCT01205945	The Effect of Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Screening on Mortality in Asian Population	Clinicaltrials.gov [66]	ongoing	No
NCT00662480	The Viborg vascular screening trial (VIVA)	ClinicalTrials.gov [67]	ongoing	No

Ongoing studies

Figure 20: Documentation of the studies from the study registry search in the report

In addition, the search strategies for all study registries, the provider, URL, and input interface (e.g. Basic Search in ClinicalTrials.gov) were presented in the appendix of the report (see Figure 21).




Figure 21: Reporting the search strategy of the report using the example of ClinicalTrials.gov

Updating searches *(Back to top)*

Since the report was published after January 2015 (12 months after the initial search), an update search was performed concurrently to the search in bibliographical databases.

The procedure was as follows: The results of the initial search and update search were compared in EndNote or Excel. The duplicate check was performed using the study registration numbers (see Figure 22).

The study status was checked again for studies identified as “ongoing” in the initial search. If the status had changed to “complete”, the studies were considered for assessment. The further procedure regarding screening, documenting and reporting corresponded to the procedure in the initial search.

Study registry ID			Results of the initial search			
Recor...	Author	Title	Journal/Secondary Title	Abstract	Custom 1	Name of Database
16		The Effect of Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Screening on Mortalit...	Nct01205945	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
98		The Effect of Abdominal Aortic Aneurysm Screening on Mortalit...	Nct01205945	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
17	Berlin-Chemie	Effects of Nebivolol on the Walking Ability in Patients with Essent...	2004-004863-32	https://www.clinical...	OLD	EU-CTR
147	Berlin-Chemie	Effects of Nebivolol on the Walking Ability in Patients with Essent...	2004-004863-32	https://www.clinical...	NEW	EU-CTR
18		Endoprosthesis Treatment Effects on Human Abdominal Aorta A...	Nct01253252	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
93		Endoprosthesis Treatment Effects on Human Abdominal Aorta A...	Nct01253252	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
19		EndoSure Sensor for Long-term Follow-up After Endovascular A...	Nct00831870	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
127		EndoSure Sensor for Long-term Follow-up After Endovascular A...	Nct00831870	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
20		Enhanced Guidance for Endovascular Repair of Abdominal Aortic...	Nct01824654	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
123		Enhanced Guidance for Endovascular Repair of Abdominal Aortic...	Nct01824654	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
21		The Epidemiology of Aortic Diameter in China	Nct00820378	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
131		The Epidemiology of Aortic Diameter in China	Nct00820378	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
22		Evaluation of Effect of Angiotensin-converting Enzyme (ACE) Inh...	Nct01118520	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
109		Evaluation of Effect of Angiotensin-converting Enzyme (ACE) Inh...	Nct01118520	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
23		Evaluation of Systemic Atherothrombosis in Patients With ARTeri...	Nct01224600	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
110		Evaluation of Systemic Atherothrombosis in Patients With ARTeri...	Nct01224600	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
24	Imperial	An evaluation of the effect of an angiotensin-converting enzyme...	2010-020226-17	https://www.clinical...	OLD	EU-CTR
139	Imperial	An evaluation of the effect of an angiotensin-converting enzyme...	2010-020226-17	https://www.clinical...	NEW	EU-CTR
25	Center	An exploratory open-label PET-observer-blinded pilot study to ev...	2011-000538-12	https://www.clinical...	OLD	EU-CTR
143	Center	An exploratory open-label PET-observer-blinded pilot study to ev...	2011-000538-12	https://www.clinical...	NEW	EU-CTR
26		Extracolonc Findings on Computed Tomography (CT) Colonogr...	Nct01465425	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
136		Extracolonc Findings on Computed Tomography (CT) Colonogr...	Nct01465425	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
27		Immediate Management of the Patient With Aneurysm Rupture ...	Nct00746122	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
106		Immediate Management of the Patient With Aneurysm Rupture ...	Nct00746122	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
28	Cardoz	An international, multi-centre, randomised, stratified, double-bli...	2011-000285-35	https://www.clinical...	OLD	EU-CTR
140	Cardoz	An international, multi-centre, randomised, stratified, double-bli...	2011-000285-35	https://www.clinical...	NEW	EU-CTR
29		IRon Nanoparticle Enhanced MRI in the Assessment of Myocardi...	Nct01995799	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
130		IRon Nanoparticle Enhanced MRI in the Assessment of Myocardi...	Nct01995799	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov
30		Keller Prehospital Ultrasound Study	Nct01074112	http://ClinicalTrials....	OLD	CT.gov
126		Keller Prehospital Ultrasound Study	Nct01074112	http://ClinicalTrials....	NEW	CT.gov

The results of the initial search will be deleted.

Results of the update search

Figure 22: Duplicate check of the search in study registries in EndNote