

Impact of librarians on reporting of the literature searching component of pediatric systematic reviews

Deborah Meert, MLIS; Nazi Torabi, MLIS; John Costella, DDS, MSc, MLIS

APPENDIX A

Assessment instrument for scoring the systematic review articles

Our element #	IOM element #	Element's description	Yes reported on page	No or unclear
	2.6.2	Provide a replicable description of the search strategy and describe parameters for selection:		
1		▪ Years considered		
2	2.6.4	▪ Reported selection criteria (e.g., study type, population/age, gender, geography, etc.)		
3		▪ Visual tool(s) to describe study inclusion process		
4		▪ the date last searched		
5	3.4.1	▪ the keywords, subject headings, and search terms that were used		
6	3.1.2	▪ Reported the search strategy to address each key research question		
7	3.2.6	Language restriction reported		
8	3.1.4	Name selected bibliographic databases and citation indexes		
9	3.1.8 3.1.9	Includes rationale for type and number of databases selected, including subject-specific databases and regional bibliographic databases if standard databases are unlikely to provide all relevant evidence.		
10	3.1.6	Search literature cited by eligible studies (<i>Backward citation tracking</i>)		
11	3.1.5	Search citation indexes (<i>Forward citation tracking</i>)		
12	3.2.1	Search gray literature databases, clinical trial registries, conference proceedings, thesis and dissertation, and other sources of published information about studies		
13	3.2.3	Invite all study sponsors to submit unpublished data/information, including unreported outcomes, for possible inclusion in the systematic review		
14	3.2.4	Hand-search selected journals and conference abstracts		
15	3.2.5	Conduct a web search		
		Total (Y+N=T), Y/T x100=Final Score		