

ABSTRACT SUBMISSION AIC 2016: #53

ABSTRACT AIC 2016

1. Title:

Living Systematic Review: an approach to bridge the research-practice gap

2. Author(s): Synnot, A^{1,2}, Turner, T¹, Thomas, J³, Akl, E⁴, McDonald, S¹, Shemilt, I³, Green, S¹, Elliott, J^{1,5}

Affiliations: ¹ Monash University, Melbourne, Australia, ² La Trobe University, Melbourne, Australia, ³ University College London, London, UK, ⁴ American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon, ⁵ Alfred Hospital, Melbourne, Australia

3. Key words: Living systematic review, evidence synthesis, pilot, research-practice gap

4. Abstract

a. Background and aims

Making evidence-based healthcare decisions necessitates systematic reviews that are timely, reliable and relevant. However, in fast-moving fields, traditional systematic reviews can quickly become out-of-date due to their time-consuming development process. Living Systematic Reviews (LSRs) are high quality, online evidence summaries that are continuously updated as new data become available. Momentum is building around LSRs as part of a living evidence ecosystem aiming to bridge current disconnects between research, guidelines and practice. Cochrane is the leading producer of systematic reviews in healthcare and is currently piloting approaches to LSRs.

The aim is to describe the approach to LSRs currently being piloted within Cochrane.

b. Methods

Living Systematic Reviews differ from traditional systematic reviews in ways that have important implications for review methods and processes. In our suite of pilot LSRs, searches are being run at a pre-determined frequency, and fed into a continuous loop of screening, data extraction, critical appraisal and synthesis. We are exploring which types of reviews would benefit from a living model. The latest online review platforms, machine learning programs and involvement of the 'crowd' are being utilized to maximize efficiency and streamline the workflow. We are working on the continual integration of new studies with the original review findings and exploring novel publication approaches.

c. Conclusion

We will review our experience with LSRs, particularly the challenges related to author workload, core review methods and review process. We will discuss proposed solutions and the key enablers, such as technology and flexible publication platforms.