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A Systematic Review identifies and synthesizes all the available evidence from carefully designed healthcare studies pertaining to a specific research question.
Successfully leading your team in a systemic review

Example of team structure in a Systematic review:

Subject experts (beginners)
Librarian
Statistician
Project manager
Systematic reviews

1. Create a research question
2. Identify eligibility criteria
3. Search for literature
4. Select studies
5. Appraise studies
6. Extract data
7. Synthesize data
8. Summarize findings
9. Report results
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Successfully leading your team in a systemic review

Project management.

The expected **time** of publication is critical for planning.

It is considered that the implementation of the search strategy should be updated after 6 - 12 months.

Keep the team **motivated** and meeting **deadlines**
Systematic reviews

Possible pitfalls

1. Excluding useful articles
2. Lack of accountability (reasons for inclusion/exclusion, numbers)
3. Extracting and registering wrong information
4. Poor risk of bias assessment
5. Other?
1. How to avoid the exclusion of useful articles?

**Train your team**

Choose some clear examples of abstracts to include and exclude.

**Screening**

Title abstract – sensitivity

Full text – specificity

Create a **short protocol** with the aim, inclusion and exclusion criteria and a brief **manual** user of the **software**.
1. How to avoid the exclusion of useful articles?

Short protocol

Scoping review of telehealth for self-care in women’s sexual and reproductive health

Objective: The objective of this scoping review is to understand the extent and type of evidence in relation to telehealth in the field of self-care for sexual and reproductive health in women.

Eligibility criteria

Inclusion criteria:
1. Studies in women of all ages, including transgender women.
2. Studies that include telehealth and self-care concepts in the field of sexual and reproductive health. Self-care practices include those that women can take on their own toward the goals of self-management, self-testing, and self-awareness.
3. Qualitative or quantitative, either observational or experimental.
4. Articles in English, Spanish, Portuguese, or French.
5. Reports of primary studies and reviews (e.g., meta-analysis, systematic or narrative)

Exclusion criteria:
1. Articles with no disaggregated data on women
2. Commentaries, letters to editor, congress abstracts, and opinion papers.
3. Articles that did not clearly stated in the aim the intention of study/ integrate information on telehealth and self-care in reproductive sexual health.
1. How to avoid the exclusion of useful articles?

Rayyan
PICO portal
Many more options
2. How to be accountable during the systematic review process?

Centralize

Team members identifying relevant articles through other sources should create a list of articles in a format (BibTeX, EndNote, etc.)

Facilitates comparison with the articles already screened.

Check the requirements of the target journal and PRISMA flowchart.
2. How to be accountable during the systematic review process?
3. How to capture the right information?

Train your team

Create a **standardized** data extraction format (REDcap, Google forms or any of the available software)

**Highlight** the information extracted in the PDF

Check at least the data extraction of the first **three articles** assigned to your reviewers, look for mistakes in the units, association or impact measures (register original units – uniform transformation)
3. How to capture right information?
4. How to perform a fair risk of bias assessment?

Depend on the type of articles included on the review

Several options of quality/risk of bias assessment tools

- Selection bias
- Information bias
- Confounding

Train your team
4. How to perform a fair risk of bias assessment?

Homogeneous criteria

Risk-of-bias tool for randomized trials (RoB 2)
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Now there is time for...

Questions & Discussion
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