

# APPENDIX A: SEARCH STRATEGIES

## MEDLINE (OVID interface)

1. search\$.tw.
2. exp "information storage and retrieval"/ or Medical Informatics/
3. Data Compression/
4. 2 not 3
5. or/1,4
6. quality control/ or Evaluation Studies/ or "reproducibility of results"/
7. (quality adj2 assess\$).tw.
8. or/6-7
9. (quality or evaluat\$).tw.
10. (precision or recall or sensitivity or relevance or specificity).tw.
11. (performance adj2 (measur\$ or indicat\$ or assess\$)).tw.
12. "Sensitivity and Specificity"/
13. or/10-12
14. (error\$ or mistake\$ or failure\$ or inaccura\$ or misspell\$).tw.
15. (MeSH or (subject adj2 heading\$) or (controlled adj2 vocabulary) or redundan\$ or explod\$ or explos\$ or spell\$ or Medline).tw.
16. truncat\$.tw.
17. (truncat\$ adj6 (protein\$ or gene\$)).mp.
18. 16 not 17
19. exp Documentation/
20. exp Molecular Sequence Data/
21. 19 not 20
22. or/15,18,21
23. EVIDENCE-BASED MEDICINE/
24. META-ANALYSIS/
25. Review.pt.
26. "Review Literature"/
27. or/23-26
28. "INFORMATION STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL"/st [Standards]
29. and/27-28
30. and/5,8,13
31. and/5,13-14
32. and/9,13,22
33. or/29-32
34. "cochrane database of systematic reviews".jn.
35. 33 not 34
36. limit 35 to yr=1980 - 2005

**HEALTH STAR (OVID): Same as MEDLINE above**

## HAPI (OVID interface)

search\$.mp

**THE COCHRANE LIBRARY  
(Wiley interface)**

**Search #1:**

(KW=(precision or recall or pertinence or performance or relevance or exhaustivity or feedback or sensitivity or specificity or efficien\*) or DE=("Retrieval performance measures" or "Relevance feedback")) and (kw=(controlled vocabulary or MeSH or explos\* or explod\* or spell\* or truncat\* or redundan\*) or (DE=("Non Boolean strategies" or "Multiple database searches" or Browsing or "Offline searching" or "Remote searching" or "Search strategies" or "Boolean strategies" or "Full text searching") or KW=(search\* or Ranking) and kw=(evaluat\* or rate or rating or assess\* or quality or validat\* or accura\* or proficien\* or effectiv\*)) or (kw=error\* or mistake\* or failure\*))

**Search #2:**

(DE=Searching and DE=Evaluation) NOT (Search #1)

**CINAHL: Cumulative Index to Nursing & Allied Health Literature  
(OVID interface)**

1. search\$.tw.
2. Medical Informatics/ or exp Information Retrieval/ or Information Science/
3. or/1-2
4. quality control/ or Evaluation Studies/ or "reproducibility of results"/
5. (quality adj2 assess\$).tw.
6. or/4-5
7. (quality or evaluat\$).tw.
8. (precision or recall or sensitivity or relevance or specificity).tw.
9. (performance adj2 (measur\$ or indicat\$ or assess\$)).tw.
10. "Sensitivity and Specificity"/
11. or/8-10
12. (error\$ or mistake\$ or failure\$ or inaccura\$ or misspell\$).tw.
13. (MeSH or (subject adj2 heading\$) or (controlled adj2 vocabulary) or redundan\$ or explod\$ or explos\$ or spell\$ or Medline).tw.
14. truncat\$.tw.
15. (truncat\$ adj6 (protein\$ or gene\$)).mp.
16. 14 not 15
17. exp Documentation/ or exp Bibliographic Control/
18. or/13,16-17
19. and/3,6,11
20. and/3,11-12
21. and/7,11,18
22. or/19-21
23. "The Cochrane Library".so.
24. 22 not 23
25. limit 24 to yr=1980-2005

**PsycINFO**
**(Scholarly literature in the behavioral sciences and mental health)  
(OVID interface)**

1. search\$.tw.
2. exp automated information retrieval/

3. or/1-2
4. quality control/ or evaluation criteria/
5. (quality adj2 assess\$.tw.
6. or/4-5
7. (quality or evaluat\$.tw.
8. (precision or recall or sensitivity or relevance or specificity).tw.
9. (performance adj2 (measur\$ or indicat\$ or assess\$)).tw.
10. or/8-9
11. (error\$ or mistake\$ or failure\$ or inaccura\$ or misspell\$).tw.
12. (MeSH or (subject adj2 heading\$) or (controlled adj2 vocabulary) or redundan\$ or explod\$ or explos\$ or spell\$ or Medline).tw.
13. truncat\$.tw.
14. (truncat\$ adj6 (protein\$ or gene\$)).mp.
15. 13 not 14
16. or/12,15
17. and/3,6,10
18. and/3,10-11
19. and/7,10,16
20. or/17-19
21. limit 20 to yr=1980-2005

## **Library and Information Science Abstracts (LISA) (CSA interface)**

### **LISA Search 1**

KW=(precision or recall or pertinence or performance or relevance or exhaustivity or feedback or sensitivity or specificity or efficien\*) and (kw=((controlled vocabulary) or MeSH or explos\* or explod\* or spell\* or truncat\* or redundan\*) or ((DE=("Non Boolean strategies" or Browsing or "Boolean strategies") or KW=(search\* or ranking)) and kw=(evaluat\* or rate or rating or assess\* or quality or validat\* or accura\* or proficien\* or effectiv\*)) or kw=(error\* or mistake\* or failure\*))

### **LISA Search 2**

(DE=Searching and DE=Evaluation) not (KW=(precision or recall or pertinence or performance or relevance or exhaustivity or feedback or sensitivity or specificity or efficien\*) and (kw=((controlled vocabulary) or MeSH or explos\* or explod\* or spell\* or truncat\* or redundan\*) or ((DE=("Non Boolean strategies" or Browsing or "Boolean strategies") or KW=(search\* or ranking)) and kw=(evaluat\* or rate or rating or assess\* or quality or validat\* or accura\* or proficien\* or effectiv\*)) or kw=(error\* or mistake\* or failure\*)))

## **Scopus - a comprehensive database for scientific, technical and medical information (Scopus web interface)**

((TITLE-ABS-KEY(quality)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY(precision) OR TITLE-ABSKEY(recall) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(sensitivity) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(specificity) OR TITLEABS- KEY(relevance) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(performance W/2 measure) OR

TITLE-ABSKEY( performance W/2 indicator) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(performance W/2 assessment)) AND (((TITLE-ABS-KEY(truncat\*)) AND NOT (TITLE-ABS-KEY(truncat\* W/6 protein) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(truncat\* W/6 gene))) OR (TITLE-ABS-KEY(mesh) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( subject W/2 heading) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(controlled W/2 vocabulary) OR TITLEABS- KEY(redundancies) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(redundant) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(explode) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(explosion) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(spelling) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( medline)))) OR ((TITLE-ABS-KEY(search\*)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY(precision) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(recall) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(sensitivity) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( specificity) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(relevance) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(performance W/2 measure) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(performance W/2 indicator) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( performance W/2 assessment)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY(error) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( mistake) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(failure) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(inaccurate) OR TITLEABS- KEY(misspelling) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(misspelled))) OR ((TITLE-ABSKEY( search\*)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY(quality)) AND (TITLE-ABS-KEY(precision) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(recall) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(sensitivity) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( specificity) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(relevance) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(performance W/2 measure) OR TITLE-ABS-KEY(performance W/2 indicator) OR TITLE-ABSKEY( performance W/2 assessment)))) AND PUBYEAR AFT 1979 AND (EXCLUDE(EXACTSRCTITLE, "Cochrane database of systematic reviews (Online : Update Software)"))

# APPENDIX B: DATA EXTRACTION AND ABSTRACTION FORM

## Data abstraction form for information retrieval research

---

1. Which of the following are discussed? (check all that apply)

- Spelling mistakes
- Spelling variants
- Truncation
- Search logic & organization
- Logical operators AND OR NOT ADJ
- Wrong line number
- Subject headings and natural language terms combined
- Subject headings missing
- Natural language terms missing
- Irrelevant subject headings/ explosion
- Irrelevant natural language terms included?
- Subject headings exploded even though no narrower terms exist?
- Redundancies
- Search strategy been adapted for each database
- Other errors (explain)

2. This paper presents: (check all that apply)

- Research evidence regarding search performance
- Theoretical rationale for impact on search performance
- Frequency of error in a particular population
- Can't tell
- None of the above

3. The major impact discussed is: (check all that apply)

- Recall (sensitivity)
- Precision
- Specificity
- Cost/Time
- Peer reviewing
- Other (describe)
- Can't tell
- None of the above

4. Summarize the evidence, noting page number after each statement. Place cut/paste in quotations please.

5. Reference number of any potentially useful references we should check, followed by brief statement of the topic.

--

### Data extraction form for scales

1. Does it address the electronic search strategy?
  - Yes
  - No
2. Does it address the search plan (e.g., choice of databases, non-electronic methods, etc.)?
  - Yes
  - No
3. Is it validated?
  - Yes
  - No
4. Is it evidence-based?
  - Yes (describe/citing evidence)
  - No
5. Characterize the type of tool:
  - Reporting guideline
  - Tool for evaluating training
  - Tool for peer reviewing or quality assessment
  - Other (specify)

### Data abstraction form for added elements

1. Which of the following are discussed? (check all that apply)
  - Additional Fields
  - Limits
  - Conceptualization
  - Other

### Complete the appropriate sections: Evidence regarding Additional Fields

2. This paper presents: (check all that apply)
  - Research evidence regarding search performance
  - Theoretical rationale for impact on search performance
  - Frequency of error in a particular population
  - Can't tell
  - None of the above

3. Is this positive or negative evidence?
- Positive (supports the importance of the element)
  - Negative (refutes the importance of the element)

4. The major impact discussed is: (check all that apply)

- Recall (sensitivity)
- Precision
- Specificity
- Cost/Time
- Peer reviewing
- Other (describe)
- Can't tell
- None of the above

5. Summarize the evidence, noting page number after each statement. Place cut/paste in quotations please.

### **Evidence regarding Limits**

6. This paper presents: (check all that apply)

- Research evidence regarding search performance
- Theoretical rationale for impact on search performance
- Frequency of error in a particular population
- Can't tell
- None of the above

7. Is this positive or negative evidence?

- Positive (supports the importance of the element)
- Negative (refutes the importance of the element)

8. The major impact discussed is: (check all that apply)

- Recall (sensitivity)
- Precision
- Specificity
- Cost/Time
- Peer reviewing
- Other (describe)
- Can't tell
- None of the above

9. Summarize the evidence, noting page number after each statement. Place cut/paste in quotations please.

### **Evidence regarding Conceptualization**

10. This paper presents: (check all that apply)

- Research evidence regarding search performance
- Theoretical rationale for impact on search performance
- Frequency of error in a particular population
- Can't tell
- None of the above

11. Is this positive or negative evidence?

- Positive (supports the importance of the element)
- Negative (refutes the importance of the element)

12. The major impact discussed is: (check all that apply)

- Recall (sensitivity)
- Precision
- Specificity
- Cost/Time
- Peer reviewing
- Other (describe)
- Can't tell
- None of the above

13. Summarize the evidence, noting page number after each statement. Place cut/paste in quotations please.

### **Evidence regarding other elements**

14. This paper presents: (check all that apply)

- Research evidence regarding search performance
- Theoretical rationale for impact on search performance
- Frequency of error in a particular population
- Can't tell
- None of the above

15. Is this positive or negative evidence?

- Positive (supports the importance of the element)
- Negative (refutes the importance of the element)

16. The major impact discussed is: (check all that apply)

- Recall (sensitivity)
- Precision
- Specificity
- Cost/Time
- Peer reviewing
- Other (describe)
- Can't tell
- None (non specific)

17. Summarize the evidence, noting page number after each statement. Place cut/paste in quotations please.

# APPENDIX C: CONSENT FORM AND SURVEY INSTRUMENT

The project was initially referred to as EHTAS (Evaluating Health Technology Assessment Searches). The name of the project was changed to PRESS (Peer Review Electronic Search Strategy) early in 2006 after consultation with local and international advisors. It was decided that PRESS was less difficult to remember and spell and thus easier to use. However, EHTAS was in use at the time of the survey.

## **Consent form**

Please read the following consent form and then answer at the bottom.

EHTAS (Evaluating Health Technology Assessment Searches). A project to develop a quality assessment checklist and an expert peer review forum for HTA searches.

Thank you for your interest in our research study to develop a quality assessment checklist for searches used in HTAs and systematic reviews and an expert forum to peer review these searches. The importance of the search quality in an HTA is to ensure an accurate and complete evidence base is used. A validated process for evaluating the quality and completeness of the evidence base for systematic reviews, including HTA reports, does not currently exist. The lack of such a process, paired with a demonstrable level of error in reported searches, leaves this type of research open to debate over the quality of evidence on which the review is based.

You are being asked to participate in a web-based survey to discuss your experiences in searching for systematic reviews. Participation is entirely voluntary. At any particular part of the survey, you may refuse to answer any particular question or stop the survey altogether.

You will never be personally identified as a participant in this study. General demographic information (e.g. respondents range in experience from 0-24 years) and generic descriptors (e.g. librarian, reviewer) will be used to describe study participants. Information will generally be presented in summary form, but some individual responses may be presented as part of the findings. Individual responses will be included as direct quotations, with no identifying information provided.

You may contact the Chair of the Ottawa Hospital Research Ethics Board for information regarding participants' rights in research studies at 1-613-798-5555 ext.14902; however, this person cannot provide detailed information with regard to this study. For questions about this study, please feel free to contact at any time the Project Office at the Institute of Population Health at 1-613-562-5800 ext.2114, or either of the study investigators below.

Sincerely,

Jessie McGowan, Principal Investigator

Senior Information Scientist, Institute of Population Health / Ottawa Health Research Institute  
Adjunct Professor, Department of Medicine, University of Ottawa  
Institute of Population Health, Room 206  
University of Ottawa  
1 Stewart Street, Ottawa, ON K1N 6N5  
(613) 562-5800 ext. 2359

Margaret Sampson, Principal Investigator,  
Senior Information Specialist, Chalmers Research Group  
CHEO Research Institute, Room 226  
401 Smyth Road, Ottawa, ON K1H 8L1  
(613) 738-3935

I consent to take part in the program EHTAS (evaluating health technology assessment searches): a project to develop a quality assessment checklist and an expert peer review forum for HTA searches.

YES

NO

Name of participant:

Email Address of Participant:

Phone Number of Participant (optional):

### **Survey Instructions**

Thank you for participating in our research study to develop a checklist for evaluating search strategies used in systematic reviews and HTAs. The goal of this research is to develop a peer reviewing tool to evaluate electronic search strategies and improve the quality of searches.

The survey asks you to assess the importance of various elements in a search strategy, to the best of your knowledge. Standard questions are asked for every element and there are 18 elements in total. The elements work from more conceptual problems to more concrete errors. Elements include conceptualization & organization, selections of terms, use of limits & fields, errors in spelling, truncation & operator use, and tailoring for different databases. Notice that we are not concerned here with the entire search plan, such as the selection of database and non-database sources. Note that you may go back to change an answer.

**Participant Background Information (to be presented in aggregated form only to describe the survey sample).**

**What is your formal training/degree? (Pick all that apply)**

MLIS

MD

MSc Epidemiology

PhD Epidemiology

Other (please specify)

**How many years experience do you have in searching?**

**How many years experience do you have doing systematic reviews or health technology assessments?**

**How many SRs or HTAs have you been involved in?**

**What country are you responding from?**

## 1. Is the search question translated well into search concepts?

**Definition:** The search includes the most important elements of the clinical question, with neither too few nor too many concepts introduced. Focus here on the broad concepts represented in the search strategy.

Score irrelevant terms in question #4 or #8 below. Score missing terms in question #3 or #6 below.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

## 2. Is the search well organized?

**Definition:** The search strategy follows a clear sequence.

Examples: All terms for the same concept are on consecutive lines, limits are placed at the end.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

### 3. Are any important subject headings missing?

**Note:** Also score here the incorrect use of a term or phrase as a subject heading (even if the system's mapping features would map it automatically to the correct subject heading). Example: "Anti-Bacterial Agents/" is the subject heading for antibiotics, but the OVID interface produces the same result with "exp Antibiotics/" as with "exp Anti-Bacterial Agents/".

Note that all examples in the survey are using the OVID interface.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil    Small    Moderate    Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil    Small    Moderate    Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

#### 4. Are any irrelevant subject headings included?

**Definition:** The use of subject headings that are not relevant for the search.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

#### 5. Are any subject headings exploded even though no narrower terms exist?

**Definition:** The explosion of a subject heading when no narrower terms exist.

Example: 1. exp eyebrows/

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

### **6. Are any natural language terms missing?**

**Definition:** Important synonyms are missing.

Missing spelling variants are noted in question #7 below. Missing concepts are noted in question #1 above.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil    Small    Moderate    Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil    Small    Moderate    Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

### **7. Are any spelling variants missing?**

**Definition:** The presentation of only one spelling of a word when other variants exist.

Failing to truncate a term should be scored here. Missed synonyms are scored in question #6 above.

Examples of spelling variants are: haem\$/hem\$, paed\$/ped\$, ischem\$/ischaem\$.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

### **8. Are any irrelevant natural language terms included?**

**Definition:** The use of natural language terms that are not relevant for the search.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

## **9. Are subject headings and natural language terms combined in the same line?**

**Definition:** The combination of subject headings & natural language terms in the same line.

This is correct to use in MEDLINE, but will not allow for re-running of the strategy in multiple databases, which is the norm in systematic reviews.

Example: 1. eye.tw,sh.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

**10. Should any additional fields be searched?**

Examples: authors, journals, publication types, floating subheadings, CAS registry numbers, etc.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

### **11. Do any of the limits used seem unwarranted?**

The following could be used to limit the search: publication types, methodological filters, languages, dates, check tags, subheadings, etc.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

## **12. Are any potentially helpful limits missing?**

Limits could be: publication types, methodological filters, languages, dates, check tags, subheadings, etc.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

### **13. Does the search strategy have any spelling mistakes or system syntax errors?**

**Definition:** A word that is misspelled or a search line that is presented in such a way that it won't run. Use for misspellings only. Missed spelling variants are scored in question #7 above.

Examples: the operator adj is spelled ajd - although the mistake is in a logical operator, it would be classified as a spelling mistake; entering example\$.tx. instead of example\$.tw.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

#### **14. Are there any errors in truncation?**

**Definition:** Typically truncating in the wrong place or inappropriate use of truncation.

Note: Failure to truncate is scored as a missed spelling variant in question #7 above.

Examples: Truncating after a plural (e.g., errors\$) or truncating too soon in the word stem.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

### **15. Are there any mistakes in the use of Boolean or proximity operators?**

**Definition:** The inappropriate use of the logical operators (e.g., AND where OR was intended, NOT with potential unintended consequences).

Example:

1. exp eye/
2. eye.tw.
3. 1 NOT 2

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

## **16. Is the wrong line number specified anywhere?**

**Definition:** The wrong line number is specified.

Example:

1. exp eye/
2. eye.tw.
3. 1 or 4

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

### **17. Does the search include redundancies without a rationale?**

**Definition:** The use of both a broader term and a narrower term, whether they are subject headings or natural language terms.

Example: Searching two versions of MEDLINE without giving a rationale is redundant.

Another example is:

1. esophag\$.tw.
2. (esophag\$ adj2 neoplas\$).tw.

The second line is narrower than the first & can't retrieve any additional material, so it is redundant.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

### **18. Has the search strategy been adapted for each database to be searched?**

**Definition:** The use of a search strategy for databases with different indexing or search features, without any indication that the search strategy was tailored for other databases.

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil     Small     Moderate     Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree     Disagree     Neutral     Agree     Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

**19. Please describe other errors that should be considered.**

Note: If you would like to suggest more than one other error, please email the details to us at [jmcgowan@uottawa.ca](mailto:jmcgowan@uottawa.ca)

a) The potential negative impact of this element on recall is:

- Nil    Small    Moderate    Large

b) The potential negative impact of this element on precision is:

- Nil    Small    Moderate    Large

c) This element indicates that the searcher may be unfamiliar with aspects of searching such as thesaurus terms, database features or search mechanics:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

d) What is your impression of the level of evidence on the importance of this element?

- Compelling research evidence
- Weak research evidence
- Contradictory research evidence
- Refuted by research evidence
- No research evidence, but is supported by expert opinion
- No research evidence, but the impact is self-evident
- Not supported

e) This element is important to consider in reviewing a search strategy:

- Strongly disagree    Disagree    Neutral    Agree    Strongly agree

**Thank you for your contribution**

Thank you for your participation in this important step in developing an assessment tool for search strategies used in systematic reviews and health technology assessments.

The results of the survey will be presented at the 2005 Cochrane Colloquium and the International Evidence-Based Librarianship Conference.

The next steps will be to revise the assessment tool based on these survey results, then have experienced searchers validate the tool by rating a series of searches.

May we contact you with information on participating in the next step of evaluating several searches, to occur in November 2005?

- Yes
- No

Are you interested in acting as a peer reviewer when the search peer review forum is launched, in January 2006?

- Yes
- No

## APPENDIX D: BIBLIOGRAPHY OF 26 SCALES IDENTIFIED

Allison JJ, Kiefe CI, Weissman NW, Carter J, Centor RM. The art and science of searching MEDLINE to answer clinical questions: finding the right number of articles. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 1999; 15(2):281-296.

Association of College and Research Libraries. *Information literacy competency standards for higher education*. Chicago: American Library Association, 2000.

Blood RW. Evaluation of online searches. *RQ* 1983; 22(3):-277.

Booth A. "Brimful of STARLITE": Towards standards for reporting literature searches. HTA: Health Technology Assessment International 1st Annual Meeting; 2004 May 31-Jun 2; Krakow (PL).

Bradley DR, Rana GK, Martin PW, Schumacher RE. Real-time, evidence-based medicine instruction: a randomized controlled trial in a neonatal intensive care unit. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2002; 90(2):194-201.

Critical Appraisal Skills Programme: finding the evidence workshop (CASfew). A 10 step strategy for more effective Medline searches [workshop]. *CASPfew*; 1998; Oxford (UK).

Crumley E, Bhatnagar N, Stobart K. Peer reviewing comprehensive search strategies in hemophilia and von Willebrand disease. *J Can Health Lib Assoc* 2004; 25(4):113-116.

Glunz D, Wakiji E. Maximizing search quality through a program of peer review. *Online* 1983; 7(5):-110.

Goodman C. Literature searching and evidence interpretation for assessing health care practices. Stockholm, Sweden: Swedish Council on Technology Assessment in Health Care, 1993:16-32.

Hawking DT, Wagers R. Online bibliographic search strategy development. *Online* 1982; 6(3):12-19.

INAHTA. INAHTA HTA Checklist. International Network of Agencies for Health Technology Assessment [unpublished]; 2001.

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

Jensen MF. Check it out! A checklist for evaluating the reporting of literature search methodology in HTAs and CPGs [poster]: Second Annual Meeting of the Health Technology Assessment International (HTAi); 2005 June 20-22; Rome.

Khan KS, 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 Ltd., 2003.

Kim CS. Predicting information searching performance with measures of cognitive diversity. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities & Social Sciences, 63(4-A), Oct 2002.

McKibbin A, Eady A, Marks S. PDQ Evidence-Based Principles and Practice. Hamilton, ON: B.C.Decker Inc., 1999.

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. *Br J Surg* 2000; 87(11):1448-1454.

Monois s, O'Hanlon N, Diaz KR. Online searching skills: development of an inventory to assess self-efficacy. *J Academic Librarianship* 2005; 31(2):98-105.

Mularski CA, Bradigan PS. End-user searching: review of a modular program. *Bull Med Libr Assoc* 1993; 81(1):61-63.

Patrick TB, Demiris G, Folk LC, Moxley DE, Mitchell JA, Tao D. Evidence-based retrieval in evidence-based medicine. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2004; 92(2):196-199.

Shea B, Dube C, Moher D. Assessing the quality of reports of systematic review: the QUOROM statement compared to other tools. In: Egger M, Smith GD, Altman DG, editors. *Systematic reviews in health care: meta-analysis in context*. London: BMJ Publishing Group, 2001: 122-139.

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. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000; 283(15):2008-2012.

The AGREE Collaboration. Appraisal of Guidelines for Research & Evaluation (AGREE) Instrument [report]. London: St. George's Hospital Medical School, 2001.

Higgins JPT and Green S. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 4.2.5 [web site]. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd. Chichester (UK): John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2005. Available: <http://www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook/hbook.htm>,

Verhoeven AAH, Boendermaker PM, Boerma EJ, Meyboom-De Jong B. A model for the evaluation of search queries in medical bibliographic sources. *Health Libr Rev* 1999; 16(3):141-150.

One additional scale was identified, but at the request of the author, we have not listed it here.

# APPENDIX E: EXCLUDED STUDIES GROUPED BY EXCLUSION REASON

Articles excluded after review of the full article are listed here. Additional references excluded on the basis of review of the bibliographic record are not shown (n=8899).

## Not relevant to peer review of electronic search strategies

Abad Garcia MF, Aleixandre Benavent R., Peris Bonet R. [Search strategies for retrieval of articles in Spanish journals. A case study: evaluation of the quality of information systems]. [Spanish]. *Gac Sanit* 1995; 9(51):363-370.

Abe S. Development of an efficient MEDLINE search strategy: a review of overseas literature. *Igaku Toshokan (Journal of the Japan Medical Library Association)* 2004; 51(3):221-229.

Allen B. Logical reasoning and retrieval performance. *Library and Information Science Research* 1993; 15(1):93-105.

Allison DA, Childers S. Index relativity and patron search strategy. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 2002; 2(1):145-153.

Ankeny ML. Evaluating end-user services: success or satisfaction. *J Acad Libr* 1991; 16(6):352-356.

Anonymous. Developing the specialised register for the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care review group (EPOC) [abstract]. *Proceedings of the 6th International Cochrane Colloquium 1998; Abstr Workshops Sci Sess Int Cochrane Coll(87)*; Baltimore.

Areu E, Brewer C, Shneiderman B. Experimental comparison of Boolean operators in bibliographic retrieval systems. *Proceedings of the First Annual ASIS Annual Meeting; 1978 Nov 13-17*; New York.

Badgett RG, Mulrow CD, Levy LS. Predictors of successful searches for medical evidence by clinicians. *VA HSR&D Eighteenth Annual Meeting*; 1999.

Badgett RG, et al. Development of an adverse drug reaction search filter [unpublished]; 1999.

Badgett RG, Mulrow C.D., Levy LS, Arterburn J. Observations on how clinicians use Sumsearch. *Health Information on the Internet* 2000; 14(April):6-7.

Ballard T. Keyword/Subject: finding the middle path. *Information Today* 1998; 15(6):58.

Bates MJ. The design of browsing and berrypicking techniques for online search interface. *Online Rev* 1989; 13(5):407-424.

Berry E, Kelly S, Hutton J, Harris KM, Smith MA. Identifying studies for systematic reviews. An example from medical imaging. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care* 2000; 16(2):668-672.

Betts R, Marrable D. Free text vs controlled vocabulary -- retrieval precision and recall over large databases. In: *Proceedings of the Fifteenth International Online Information Meeting; 1991 Dec 10-12*; London:153-165.

Bidwell S. Diminishing returns in information searching. ISTAHC Annual Meeting 2001; June 3-6; Philadelphia:1-4.

Bond CS. Web users' information retrieval methods and skills. *Online Information Review* 2004; 28(4):254-259.

Booth A, O'Rourke A. Searching for evidence: principles and practice. *Evid Based Med* 1999; 4(5):133-136.

Borgman CL. Why are online catalogs hard to use? Lessons learned from information-retrieval studies. *J Am Soc Inf Sci* 1986; 37(6):387-400.

Borgman CL. All users of information retrieval systems are not created equal: an exploration into individual differences. *Information Processing and Management* 1989; 25(3):-251.

Boynton J, Glanville J, Lefebvre C. Identifying systematic reviews on Medline: a highly sensitive search. *First Symposium on Systematic Reviews: Beyond the Basics*; 1998 Jan; Oxford (UK).

Brazier H. Poorly executed and inadequately documented? An analysis of the literature searches on which systematic reviews are based. *2nd Symposium on Systematic Reviews: Beyond the Basics*; 1999 Jan; Oxford (UK).

Burdett S, Stewart LA, Tierney J.F. Searching bibliographic databases: costs and benefits. *2nd International Conference Scientific Basis of Health Services & 5th Annual Cochrane Colloquium* 1999; 1997 Oct; Amsterdam.

Chan HC, Tan BCY, Wei KL. Three important determinants of user performance for database retrieval. *Int J Hum Comput Stud* 1999; 51(5):895-918.

Chan L. The Hunt for Grey Literature - Planning, Searching & Tracking [PowerPoint presentation]. Alberta Heritage Foundation for Medical Research and University of Alberta; 2004.

Chen HL. An analysis of image retrieval tasks in the field of art history. *Information Processing and Management* 2001; 37(5):701-720.

Chen SH. Searching the online catalog and the World Wide Web. *Journal of Educational Media and Library Sciences* 2003; 41(1):29-43.

Cheney PH, Nelson RR. A tool for measuring and analysing end user computing abilities. *Information Processing and Management* 1988; 24(2):-203.

Cheng GYT. Educational workshop improved information-seeking skills, knowledge, attitudes and the search outcome of hospital clinicians: a randomised controlled trial. *Health Info Libr J* 2003; 20(Supplement 1):22-33.

- Ciliberti A, Radford ML, Radford GP, Ballard T. Empty handed? A material availability study and transaction log analysis verification. *J Acad Libr* 1998; 24(4):282-289.
- Clark MM. Evaluation of searching. *Evaluating acquisitions and collection management*. Haworth Press, 1991: 131-147.
- Collas D, Chartron G. Logique conceptuelle et recherche d'information. Conceptualization and information searching. *Documentaliste* 1994; 31(1):9-15.
- Comeau DC, Wilbur WJ. Non-word identification or spell checking without a dictionary. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 2004; 55(2):169-177.
- Conn VS, Isaramalai SA, Rath S, Jantarakupt P, Wadhawan R, Dash Y. Beyond MEDLINE for literature searches. *J Nurs Scholarsh* 2003; 35(2):177-182.
- Cousins SA. Enhancing subject access to OPACs: Controlled vocabulary vs natural language. *Journal of Documentation* 1992; 48(3):291-309.
- Dozier M, Haig A. BEME Guide No. 3: Systematic searching for evidence in medical education - Part 2: Constructing searches. *Med Teach* 2003; 25(5):463-484.
- Duff A. The literature search: a library-based model for information skills instruction. *Library Review* 1996; 45(4):14-18.
- Dumbrigue HB, Esquivel JF, Jones JS. Assessment of MEDLINE search strategies for randomized controlled trials in prosthodontics. *J Prosthodont* 2000; 9(1):8-13.
- Dunn K, Vieira DL. Peer training in expert searching: the observation effect. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2005; 93(1):69-73.
- Eldredge J. Cohort studies in health sciences librarianship. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2002; 90(4):380-392.
- Eldredge JD. Evidence-based librarianship: what might we expect in the years ahead? *Health Info Libr J* 2002; 19(2):71-77.
- Erickson S, Warner ER. The impact of an individual tutorial session on MEDLINE use among obstetrics and gynaecology residents in an academic training programme: a randomized trial. *Med Educ* 1998; 32(3):269-273.
- Fairhall D. In search of searching skills. *J Info Sci* 1985; 10(3):111-123.
- Fenichel CH. The process of searching online bibliographic databases: a review of research. *Library Research* 1980; 2:107-127.
- Fenichel CH. An examination of the relationship between searching behaviour and searcher background. *Online Rev* 1980; 4(4):341-347.
- Fenichel CH. Online searching: measures that discriminate among users with different types of experiences. *J Am Soc Inf Sci* 1981; 32(1):23-32.

- Fiander PM. Health science librarians and end user searching. *Bib Medica Can* 1995; 17(2):52-56.
- Fonteyn ME. Teaching advanced practice nursing students how to use the Internet to support an evidence-based clinical practice. *AACN Clin Issues* 2001; 12(4):509-519.
- Ford N, Ford R. Cognitive styles and database access. In: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth International Online Information Meeting 1992; 1992 Dec 8-10*; London:399-413.
- Ford N, Miller D, Moss N. Web search strategies and retrieval effectiveness: an empirical study. *Journal of Documentation* 2002; 58(1):30-48.
- Fox RN, Ventura MR. Efficiency of automated literature search mechanisms. *Nurs Res* 1984; 33(3):174-177.
- Fraser C, Thomson MA. Developing the specialised register for the Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care Review Group (EPOC). 6th Annual Cochrane Colloquium; Oct 1998; Baltimore.
- Fraumeni M. A quantitative analysis of publication type indexing of sources used in the development of practice guidelines and evidence-based summaries in oncology insights again from a provincial cancer agency. *Bib Medica Can* 2002; 23(4):141-146.
- Ghali WA, Saitz R, Eskew AH, Gupta M, Quan H, Hershman WY. Successful teaching in evidence-based medicine. *Med Educ* 2000; 34(1):18-22.
- Goncalves A. Determinantes da eficacia em pesquisas em CD-ROM. Determinants of efficiency in research on CD-ROM. *Cadernos BAD* 1991;(1):117-123.
- Hawkins DT. Multiple database searching: techniques and pitfalls. *Online* 1978; 2(2):9-15.
- Haynes KJM, Huang J. The issue of word division in cataloging Chinese language titles. *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 2004; 38(1):27-42.
- Haynes RB, McKibbin KA, Walker CJ, Ryan N, Fitzgerald D, Ramsden MF. Online access to MEDLINE in clinical settings. A study of use and usefulness. *Ann Intern Med* 1990; 112(1):78-84.
- Haynes RB, Ramsden MF, McKibbin KA, Walker CJ. Online access to MEDLINE in clinical settings: impact of user fees. *Bull Med Libr Assoc* 1991; 79(4):377-381.
- Heine MH. An investigation of the relative influences of database informativeness, query size and query term specificity on the effectiveness of MEDLINE searching. *J Info Sci* 1995; 21(3):173-185.
- Helmer D, Savoie I, Green C. How do various fugitive literature searching methods impact the comprehensiveness of literature uncovered for systematic review? 4th International Conference on Grey Literature; 1999 Oct 4-5; Washington:1-7.
- Helmer D, Savoie I. Do extended searches fill the bill? Evaluating the quality of the literature retrieved. *ISTAHC 17th Annual Meeting* 2002; 2001 Jun 3-6; Philadelphia.

- Hersh W, Hickam DH, Haynes RB, McKibbin KA. Evaluation of SAPHIRE: an automated approach to indexing and retrieving medical literature. In: *Proceedings of the Fifteenth the Annual Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care, 1991 November*; Washington:808-812.
- Hersh W, Turpin A, Price S, Kraemer D, Olson D, Chan B, Sacherek L. Challenging conventional assumptions of automated information retrieval with real users: Boolean searching and batch retrieval evaluations. *Information Processing and Management* 2001; 37(3):383-402.
- Hersh WR, Hickam DH. A comparison of retrieval effectiveness for three methods of indexing medical literature. *Am J Med Sci* 1992; 303(5):292-300.
- Hersh WR, Hickam DH. A comparison of two methods for indexing and retrieval from a full-text medical database. *Med Decis Making* 1993; 13(3):220-226.
- Hersh WR, Hickam DH, Haynes RB, McKibbin KA. A performance and failure analysis of SAPHIRE with a MEDLINE test collection. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 1994; 1(1):51-60.
- Hersh WR, Pentecost J, Hickam D. A task-oriented approach to information retrieval evaluation. *J Am Soc Inf Sci* 1996; 47(1):50-56.
- Hersh WR, Crabtree MK, Hickam DH, Sacherek L, Friedman CP, Tidmarsh P, Mosbaek C, Kraemer D. Factors associated with success in searching MEDLINE and applying evidence to answer clinical questions. *J Am Med Inform Assoc* 2002; 9(3):283-293.
- Hovde K. CD-ROM instruction: teaching by bad example. *College and Undergraduate Libraries* 1995; 2(2):1-17.
- Hsieh-Yee I. Effects of search experience and subject knowledge on the search tactics of novice and experienced searchers. *J Am Soc Inf Sci* 1993; 44(3):161-174.
- Hug GP. Literature search improvement project. *Med Ref Serv Q* 2001; 20(4):39-46.
- Irvin E, Furlan A, Day D, Bombardier C. Are search strategies reported accurately in reviews? [abstract]. *XI Cochrane Colloquium: Evidence, Health Care and Culture*; 2003 Oct 26-31; Barcelona:76.
- Jansen BJ, Spink A, Bateman J, Saracevic T. Real life information retrieval: A study of user queries on the web. *SIGIR Forum* 1998; 32(1):5-17.
- Jefferson T, Alderson P, Wager E, Davidoff F. Effects of editorial peer review. A systematic review. *JAMA* 2002; 287(21):2784-2786.
- Jenssen TK, Vinterbo S. A set-covering approach to specific search for literature about human genes. In: *Proceedings of the AMIA Annual Symposium, 2000*:384-388.
- Johnson ED, McKinin EJ, Sievert M. The application of quality filters in searching the clinical literature: some possible heuristics. *Medical Reference Services Quarterly* 1992; 11(4):39-59.
- Joyce J. My way or the right way: A round-up of guidelines for searching "Hedging our Bets". *18th Annual Meeting of ISTAHC*; 2002; Berlin.

- Kagolovsky Y, Mohr JR. A structured model for evaluation of information retrieval (IR). *Medinfo* 1998; 9(Pt 1):171-175.
- Khan MS, Khor S. Enhanced web document retrieval using automatic query expansion. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 2004; 55(1):29-40.
- Kirpalani H, Schmidt B, McKibbon KA, Haynes RB, Sinclair JC. Searching MEDLINE for randomized clinical trials involving care of the newborn. *Pediatrics* 1989; 83(4):543-546.
- Kristensen J. Hakutesauruksen vaikutus sanahakuihin. The effectiveness of a search-aid thesaurus in query expansion of free-text searches. *Kirjastotiede ja Informatiika* 1993; 12(3):95-104.
- Lazar J, Norcio A. Training novice users in developing strategies for responding to errors when browsing the web. *Int J Hum Comput Interact* 2003; 15(3):361-377.
- Losee RM. Upper bounds for retrieval performance and their user measuring performance and generating optimal Boolean queries: can it get any better than this? *Information Processing and Management* 1994; 30(2):193-203.
- Marchant MP. Strategies for teaching the optimizing of search strategies. *Journal of Education for Librarianship* 1976; 16(3):155-161.
- Marson AG, Chadwick DW. How easy are randomized controlled trials in epilepsy to find on Medline? The sensitivity and precision of two Medline searches. *Epilepsia* 1996; 37(4):377-380.
- Matthews EJ, Edwards AGK, Barker J, Bloor M, Covey J, Hood K, Pill R, Russell I, Stott N, Wilkinson C. Efficient literature searching in diffuse topics: lessons from a systematic review of research on communicating risk to patients in primary care. *Health Libr Rev* 1999; 16(2):112-120.
- McCain KW. Descriptor and citation retrieval in the medical behavioral sciences literature: retrieval overlaps and novelty distribution. *J Am Soc Inf Sci* 1989; 40(2):110-114.
- McDonald S. The precision of search terms in the MEDLINE highly sensitive search strategy. *Cochrane Methods Group Newsletter* 2001; June:23-24.
- McGowan J. For expert literature searching, call a librarian. *CMAJ* 2001; 165(10):1301-1302.
- McKibbon KA, Haynes RB, Johnston ME, Walker CJ. A study to enhance clinical end-user MEDLINE search skills: design and baseline findings. In: *Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care; 1991 Nov 17-20; Washington:73-77.*
- McKibbon KA, Walker-Dilks CF, Wilczynski NL, Haynes RB. Beyond ACP Journal Club: how to harness MEDLINE for review articles [editorial]. *ACP Journal Club* 1996; 124(3):A12-A13.
- McLellan F. 1966 and all that- when is a literature search done? *Lancet* 2001; 358(9282):646.
- Mendonca EA, Cimino JJ. Building a knowledge base to support a digital library. *Medinfo* 2001; 10(Pt 1):221-225.
- Meyer DE, Ruiz D. How often do searchers really fail? *Database* 1991; 14(3):63-64.

- Montgomery CH, Sherif K. The information problem in women's health: a piece of the solution.[see comment]. *J Womens Health Gend Based Med* 2000; 9(5):529-536.
- Morris RT, Holtum EA, Curry DS. Being there: the effect of the user's presence on MEDLINE search results. *Bull Med Libr Assoc* 1982; 70(3):298-304.
- Nelson JL. An analysis of transaction logs to evaluate the educational needs of end users. *Med Ref Serv Q* 1992; 11(4):11-21.
- Neway JM, Lancaster FW. The correlation between pertinence and rate of citation duplication in multidatabase searches. *J Am Soc Inf Sci* 1983; 34(4):292-293.
- Nims JK, Rich L. How successfully do users search the Web? *College and Research Libraries News* 1998; 59(3):155-158.
- Nowicki S. Student vs. Search engine: undergraduates rank results for relevance. *Portal: Libraries and the Academy* 2003; 3(3):503-515.
- O'Neill ET, Vizine Goetz D. The impact of spelling errors on databases and indexes. In: *National Online Meeting Proceedings; 1989 May 9-11*; New York:313-320.
- Ojala M. Troubleshooting your search: whatever can go wrong, will go wrong. *Online* 1995; 19(6):59-61.
- Ojala M. When bad searches happen to good searchers. *Online* 2003; 27(1):58-60.
- Oldroyd BK, Schroder JJ. Study of strategies used in online searching: 2. Positional Logic-an example of the importance of selecting the right Boolean operator. *Online Rev* 1982; 6(2):127-133.
- Oxman AD, Sackett DL, Guyatt GH. Users' guides to the medical literature. I. How to get started. The Evidence-Based Medicine Working Group. *JAMA* 1993; 270(17):2093-2095.
- Pao ML. Relevance odds of retrieval overlaps from seven search fields. *Information Processing and Management* 1994; 30(3):305-314.
- Park AL. A comparison of a new OCLC/PRISM searches with earlier OCLC Derived searches. *Cataloging and Classification Quarterly* 1992; 15(4):89-105.
- Park J, Niederman R. Estimating MEDLINE's identification of randomized control trials in pediatric dentistry. *J Clin Pediatr Dent* 2002; 26(4):395-399.
- Perdue B, Piotrowski C. Online database use in psychology: a survey of academic libraries. *Collection Management* 1991; 14(1/2):133-137.
- Pesenti M. La ricerca in Internet: come orientarsi. Internet research: following the right path. *Biblioteche Oggi* 2000; 18(10):14-17.
- Poisson EH. End-user searching in medicine. *Bull Med Libr Assoc* 1986; 74(4):-299.

Poler EM. Overcoming limitations in database searches. Thirteenth National Online Meeting; 1992; Medford (NJ):247-254.

Sampson M. Getting the right knowledge to the right people at the right time. Perspectives on Natural Health Products. Ottawa: Chalmers Research Group for Natural Health Products Directorate, Health Canada; 2002.

Sampson M, Zhang L, Ajiferuke I. Optimizing search strategies to identify randomized controlled trials in Medline. 12th Cochrane Colloquium; 2004 Oct 2-6; Ottawa:23.

Santesso N. Emphasis on the need for guidelines for documentation of search strategy and results was needed, criticism of a Cochrane review was not.[comment]. J Med Libr Assoc 2004; 92(4):393-394.

Saracevic T. Measuring the degree of agreement between searchers. Challenges to an information society proceedings of the Seventh ASIS annual meeting; 1984:230.

Sassi F, Archard L, McDaid D. Searching literature databases for health care economic evaluations: how systematic can we afford to be? Med Care 2002; 40(5):387-394.

Scherer RW, Dickersin K, Kaplan E. The accessible biomedical literature represents a fraction of all studies in a field. In: Weeks R, Kinser D, editors. Editing the refereed scientific journal. New York: IEEE Press, 1994: 120-125.

Shapiro AR. Taming variability in free text: application to health surveillance. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2004; 53 (Suppl):95-100.

Shojania KG, Bero LA. Taking advantage of the explosion of systematic reviews: an efficient MEDLINE search strategy. Eff Clin Pract 2001; 4(4):157-162.

Shuman BA. One false drop deserves another: file selection as a means of increasing precision in online searches. Thirteenth National Online Meeting 1992;345-500.

Sjogren P, Halling A. Medline search validity for randomised controlled trials in different areas of dental research. Br Dent J 2002; 192(2):97-99.

Spoor P, Airey M, Bennett C, Greensill J, Williams R. Use of the capture-recapture technique to evaluate the completeness of systematic literature searches. Br Med J 1996; 313(7053):342-343.

Srinivasan P. Retrieval feedback in MEDLINE. J Am Med Inform Assoc 1996; 3(2):157-167.

Syu I, Lang SD. Adapting a diagnostic problem-solving model to information retrieval. Information Processing and Management 2000; 36(2):313-330.

Tenopir C. Search strategies for full text databases. In: *Proceedings of the 51st Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science; 1988 Oct 23-27; Atlanta:80-86.*

Tenopir C. Contributions of value added fields and full-text searching in full-text databases. National Online Meeting; 1985 Apr 30-May 2; New York:463-470.

The OSTR Collaborative Group. How good are volunteers at searching for published randomized controlled trials? Ottawa Stroke Trials Registry. Fundam Clin Pharmacol 1995; 9(4):384-386.

van Tulder MW, Koes BW, Bouter LM. The importance of a systematic search strategy. 2nd International Conference Scientific Basis of Health Services & 5th Annual Cochrane Colloquium; 1997.

Wagers R. Can easy searching be good searching? a model for easy searching. Online 1989; 13(3):-85.

Walker CJ, McKibbin KA, Haynes RB, Johnston ME. Performance appraisal of online MEDLINE access routes. In: *Proceedings of the Annual Symposium on Computer Applications in Medical Care; 1992*:483-487.

Walker CJ. Evidence-based medicine for librarians: panning for gold [unpublished]; 1998;1-38.

Weller AC. Mounting evidence that librarians are essential for comprehensive literature searches for meta-analyses and Cochrane reports. *J Med Libr Assoc* 2004; 92(2):163-164.

Wildemuth BM, Bliet R, Friedman CP. Measures of searcher performance: a psychometric evaluation. *Information Processing and Management* 1993; 29(5):533-550.

Wolfram D, Dimitroff A. Hypertext Vs Boolean-based searching in a bibliographic database environment: a direct comparison of searcher performance. *Information Processing and Management* 1998; 34(6):669-679.

Wozny LA. College students as end user searchers: one university's experience. *Rq* 1988; 28(1):54-61.

Yuan W. End-user searching behaviour in information retrieval: a longitudinal study. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science* 1997; 48(3):218-234.

Zhang L, Ajiferuke I, Sampson M. Optimizing search strategies to identify randomized controlled trials in Medline. *BMC* 2004;1-21.

### **Excluded because the document could not be obtained**

Bourg JW. Beyond descriptive statistics: a methodology for evaluating on-line searcher performance. Third ASIS Annual Meeting 1980; October 5-10, Anaheim CA:61-63.

Ebinuma Y, Takahashi S. The retrieval efficiency tests of descriptors and free vocabulary terms in INIS on-line search [In Japanese]. *Joho Kanri (Journal of Information Processing and Management)* 1981; 24(2):-149.

Kohler C, Wagner C. On the efficiency of different search strategies. ISLIC International Conference on Information Science; 1971 Aug 29-Sept 3; Tel Aviv.

Warner J. Retrieval performance tests in relation to online bibliographic searching. In: *Proceedings of the Fifth Annual Meeting of the American Society for Information Science; 1992 Oct 26-29; Pittsburgh (PA)*:231-241.

## APPENDIX F: SEARCHES ASSESSED IN PRESS PILOT

**Search 1. Trinh KV, Phillips SD, Ho E, Damsma K. Acupuncture for the alleviation of lateral epicondyle pain: a systematic review. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2004; 43(9):1085 – 1090.**

- (1) lateral epicondyle pain.mp. [mp = ti, tc, sh, ab, it, kw, rw]
- (2) lateral epicondylitis.mp.
- (3) epicondylitis.mp.
- (4) epicondyle pain.mp.
- (5) tennis elbow.mp.
- (6) elbow pain.mp.
- (7) tendonitis
- (8) 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 or 5 or 6 or 7;
- (9) acupuncture.mp.
- (10) NSAID
- (11) analgesics
- (12) anti-inflammatory drug
- (13) ultrasound
- (14) treatments.mp
- (15) 9 or 10 or 11 or 12 or 13 or 14
- (16) prognosis.mp.
- (17) disease free survival.mp.
- (18) randomized controlled trial.mp.
- (19) placebo
- (20) cohort study.mp.
- (21) natural history.mp.
- (22) 17 or 18 or 19 or 20 or 21 or 22
- (23) 8 and 15 and 22

---

**Search 2. Dodek P, Keenan S, Cook D, Heyland D, Jacka M, Hand L, Muscedere J, Foster D, Mehta N, Hall R, Brun-Buisson C. Evidence-based clinical practice guideline for the prevention of ventilator-associated pneumonia. *Ann Intern Med* 2004; 141(4): 305 – 313.**

The search strategy used in the development of this guideline was as follows:

exp pneumonia/ or exp pneumonia, aspiration/ or "pneumonia".mp. OR  
exp respiratory tract infections/ or "respiratory tract infection".mp OR  
exp cross infection/ or "cross infection".mp  
AND  
exp critical care/ or "critical care".mp. OR  
exp intensive care units/ or "intensive care unit". mp  
AND

exp clinical trials/ or exp randomized controlled trials/ or  
"controlled trials".mp.

AND

exp prospective studies/ or "prospective studies".mp

To increase the sensitivity of the search, we performed additional searches by using the terms mechanical ventilation, enteral nutrition, and nutrition instead of critical care and intensive care unit.

---

**Search 3. Uitterhoeve RJ, Vernooij M, Litjens M, Potting K, Bensing J, De Mulder P, van Achterberg T. Psychosocial interventions for patients with advanced cancer - a systematic review of the literature. *Br J Cancer* 2004; 91(6): 1050 - 1062.**

Search strategy

Medline (1990 - 2002)

((('Neoplasms-/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or (cancer\* in ab) or (tumor\* in ab) or (tumour\* in ab) or (malign\* in ab) or (oncolog\* in ab))

and (('Palliative-Care'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Terminal-Care'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Hospice-Care'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Terminally-Ill'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or (incurable in ab) or (incurable in ti) or (advanced in ab) or (advanced in ti) or (palliat\* in ab) or (palliat\* in ti) or (terminal\* in ab) or (terminal\* in ti)))

and ((explode 'Psychotherapy-/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Patient-Education'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Cognitive-Therapy'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or (explode 'Behavior- Therapy'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or (explode 'Adaptation-Psychological'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Counseling-/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or ('Social-Support'/all subheadings in MIME,MJME) or (psychosocial in ab) or (psychosocial in ti)))

and (((Randomized- Controlled-Trial in pt) or (Controlled-Clinical-Trial in pt) or (randomized controlled trials in MIME,MJME) or (random allocation in MIME,MJME) or (double-blind method in MIME,MJME) or (single- blind method in MIME,MJME) or (Clinical-Trial in pt) or (clinical trials in MIME,MJME) or ('clinical trial') or ((singl\* or doubl\* or trebl\* or tripl\*) and (mask\* or blind\*)) or ('latin square') or (placebos in MIME,MJME) or placebo\* or random\* or (research design in MIME,MJME) or (comparative study in MIME,MJME) or (evaluation studies in MIME,MJME) or (follow-up studies in MIME,MJME) or (prospective studies in MIME,MJME) or (cross-over studies in MIME,MJME) or control\* or prospective\* or volunteer\*))

not ((animal in MIME,MJME) not (human in MIME,MJME)))

Hits 328

Cinahl (1990 - 2002)

((('Neoplasms-'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or (cancer in ab) or (tumor\* in ab) or (tumour\* in ab) or (malign\* in ab) or (oncolog\* in ab)) and ((explode 'Terminal-Care'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or ('Terminally- Ill-Patients'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or (incurable in ab) or (incurable in ti) or (advanced in ab) or (advanced in ti) or (palliat\* in ab) or (palliat\* in ti) or (terminal\* in ab) or (terminal\* in ti)))) and (((explode 'Psychotherapy-'/all topical subheadings/ all age subheadings in DE) or (explode 'Behavior- Therapy'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or ('Coping-'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or (('Caregiver-Support'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or ('Support- Groups'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE)) or ('Social-Networks'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or (explode 'Counseling-'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or ('Death-Education'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or ('Patient-Education'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or (psychosocial in ab) or (psychosocial in ti)) and ((Clinical-Trial in DT) or (clinical-trials in DE) or (double-blind-studies in DE) or (single-blind-studies in DE) or (triple-blind-studies in DE) or ((singl\* or doubl\* or trebl\* or tripl\*) and (mask\* or blind\*)) or ('latin square') or (placebo in DE) or placebo\* or random\* or (study design in DE) or (explode 'quasi experimental studies'/all topical subheadings/all age subheadings in DE) or (pretest posttest control group design in DE) or (solomon four group design in DE) or (crossover design in DE) or (repeated measures in DE) or (pretest posttest design in DE) or (experimental studies in DE) or control\* or prospective\* or volunteer\* or compar\*)

Hits 179

PsycInfo (1990 - 2002)

((('Neoplasms-' in DE) or (cancer in ab) or (tumor\* in ab) or (tumour\* in ab) or (malign\* in ab) or (oncolog\* in ab)) and (('Palliative-Care' in DE) or (('Terminal- Cancer' in DE) or ('Terminally-Ill-Patients' in DE)) or ('Hospice-' in DE) or (incurable in ab) or (incurable in ti) or (advanced in ab) or (advanced in ti) or (palliat\* in ab) or (palliat\* in ti) or (terminal\* in ab) or (terminal\* in ti))) and (('Coping-Behavior' in DE) or ('Support - Groups' in DE) or ('Social-Support-Networks' in DE) or (explode 'Psychotherapy - ' in DE) or ('Cognitive- Therapy' in DE) or ('Art-Therapy' in DE) or ('Counseling-' in DE) or ('Self-Management' in DE) or ('Client-Education' in DE) or (psychosocial in ab) or (psychosocial in ti))) and ((experimental design in DE) or (Clinical-Trial in pt) or (clinical trial) or ((singl\* or doubl\* or trebl\* or tripl\*) and (mask\* or blind\*)) or ('latin square') or (placebo in DE) or placebo\* or random\* or (follow-up studies in DE) or (prospective studies in DE) or (repeated-measures in DE) or (Treatment-Outcome-Study in pt) or (treatment effectiveness evaluation in DE) or control\* or prospective\* or volunteer\* or compar\*)

Hits 328 Hits 179 Hits 77  
Hits 77

---

**Search 4. El-Kadiki A, Sutton AJ. Role of multivitamins and mineral supplements in preventing infections in elderly people: systematic review and meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2005; 330(7496):871.**

1. exp vitamins/ (151282)
2. vitamins\$.tw. (66130)
3. micronutients/ (416)
4. or/1-3 (170821)
5. exp trace elements/ (148034)
6. trace element\$.tw. (5425)
7. exp antioxidants/ (61933)
8. antioxidant\$.tw. (25297)
9. retinal.tw. (6447)
10. exp ascorbic acid/ (20047)
11. ascorbic acid.tw. (11170)
12. tocopherol\$.tw. (8012)
13. menadione.tw. (1324)
14. menaquinone.tw. (483)
15. cobalt.tw. (9245)
16. copper.tw. (25369)
17. fluoride.tw. (17480)
18. fluorine.tw. (3529)
19. iodine.tw. (17022)
20. iron.tw. (52427)
21. manganese.tw. (8237)
22. zinc.tw. (33788)
23. selenium.tw. (9115)
24. molybdenum.tw. (2335)
25. chromium.tw. (6575)
26. silicon.tw. (6575)
27. exp minerals/ (51560)
28. mineral\$.tw. (39718)
29. or/5-28 (366069)
30. eating/ (23360)
31. dietary supplements/ (3442)
32. food.tw. (86122)
33. food/ (12576)
34. or/30-33 (110404)
35. 29 and 34 (10098)
36. 4 or 35 (177226)
37. exp infection/(307738)
38. infection\$. tw. (415904)
39. exp immunity/ (570166)
40. "allergy and immunology"/(2871)
41. im.fs. (785484)
42. (immune or immunity or immunology\$.ti. (106979)
43. or/37-42 (1522096)
44. 36 and 43 (13338)
45. exp aged/ (1215692)
46. elderly.tw.(1215692)
47. old\$ person\$.tw. (3420)

48. old\$ people\$. tw. (5210)
49. or/45-48 (1226166)
50. 44 and 49 (997)
51. guideline.pt. (9980)
52. practice guideline.pt. (6066)
53. exp guidelines/ (27374)
54. health planning guidelines/ (876)
55. or/51-54 (37965)
56. meta-analysis/ (3999)
57. exp review literature/ (1350)
58. (meta-analy\$ or meta analy\$ or metaanaly\$).tw (7483)
59. meta analysis.pt. (6071)
60. review academic.pt.(60389)
61. review literature.pt (26302)
62. letter.pt. (444983)
63. review of reported cases.pt. (43658)
64. historical article.pt. (193586)
65. review multicase.pt. (6620)
66. or/56-61
67. or 62-65
68. 66 not 67 (97252)
69. 55 or 68 (134197)
70. 50 and 69 (11)
71. limit 70 to (human and English language) (10)
72. randomised controlled trial.pt. (152463)
73. controlled clinical trial.pt. (59132)
74. randomised controlled trials/ (20675)
75. random allocation/ (44901)
76. double blind method/ (67074)
77. single blind method/ (6136)
78. clinical trial.pt. (321481)
79. (random\$ adj5 trial\$).tw.(47760)
80. or/72-79 (374582)
81. 50 and 80 (173)
82. limit 81 to (human and English language) (153)
83. exp epidemiologic studies/ (612374)
84. (case\$ adj3 control\$).tw.(34604)
85. epidemiolog\$.ti.(49352)
86. or/83-85 (669165)
87. 50 and 86 (126)
88. limit 87 to (human and English language) (111)
89. from 71 keep 1-10 (10)
90. from 82 keep 1-153 (153)
91. from 88 keep 1-111 (111)

Search Strategy using database: CINAHL

1. exp vitamins/ (3253)

2. vitamin\$.tw. (2044)
3. micronutrients/ (185)
4. or/1-3 (3960)
5. exp trace elements/ (1211)
6. trace element\$. Tw. (67)
7. antioxidants/ (682)
8. antioxidant\$.tw. (502)
9. retinal.tw. (125)
10. exp ascorbic acid/ (479)
11. ascorbic acid.tw. (94)
12. tocopherol\$.tw. (102)
13. menadione.tw. (0)
14. menaquinone.tw. (2)
15. cobalt.tw. (21)
16. copper.tw. (163)
17. fluoride.tw. (276)
18. fluorine.tw. (10)
19. iodine.tw. (211)
20. iron.tw. (868)
21. manganese.tw. (29)
22. zinc.tw. (405)
23. selenium.tw. (115)
24. molybdenum.tw. (11)
25. chromium.tw. (60)
26. silicon.tw. (24)
27. exp minerals/ (526)
28. mineral\$.tw. (955)
29. or/5-28 (4604)
30. eating/ (159)
31. dietary supplementation/ (2136)
32. food/ (1235)
33. food.tw. (4903)
34. or/ 30-33 (7704)
35. 29 and 34 (904)
36. exp infection/ (12508)
37. infection\$.tw. (14150)
38. "allergy and immunology"/ (44)
39. im.fs. (244)
40. (immune or immunity or immunolog\$.tw. (2613)
41. exp immunity/ (2068)
42. or/36-41 (24704)
43. 4 or 35 (4331)
44. exp aged/ (60050)
45. elderly.tw. (11728)
46. old\$ person\$.tw. (993)
47. old\$ people\$.tw. (1979)
48. or/44-47 (62151)

49. 43 and 42 (234)
50. 49 and 42 (40)
51. from 50 keep 1-40 (40)

Search strategy for database AMED (Allied and Complementary Medicine)  
< 1985 to December 2001>

1. exp vitamins/ (1209)
2. vitamin\$.tw. (1160)
3. micronutrients/ (6)
4. or/1-3 (1364)
5. exp trace elements/ (401)
6. trace element\$. Tw. (138)
7. antioxidants/ (193)
8. antioxidant\$. Tw. (363)
9. retinal.tw. (3)
10. exp ascorbic acid/ (162)
11. ascorbic acid.tw. (183)
12. tocopherol\$.tw. (27)
13. menadione.tw. (3)
14. menaquinone.tw. (0)
15. cobalt.tw. (19)
16. copper.tw. (76)
17. fluoride.tw. (22)
18. fluorine.tw. (3)
19. iodine.tw. (32)
20. iron.tw. (90)
21. manganese.tw. (13)
22. zinc.tw. (127)
23. selenium.tw. (107)
24. molybdenum.tw. (7)
25. chromium.tw. (37)
26. silicon.tw. (12)
27. exp minerals/ (484)
28. mineral\$.tw. (843)
29. or/5-28 (1795)
30. eating/ (57)
31. food/ (355)
32. food.tw. (1061)
33. exp diet/ (937)
34. or/30-33 (1893)
35. 29 and 34 (205)
36. 4 or 35 (1474)
37. exp aged/ (4323)
38. elderly.tw. (2352)
39. old\$ person\$. Tw. (238)
40. old\$ people\$. tw. (354)
41. or/37-40 (4991)

42. 36 and 41 (58)
43. exp infection/ (252)
44. infection\$.tw. (1842)
45. exp immunity/ (331)
46. exp immune system/ (831)
47. (immunity or immune or immunology\$). Tw. (1599)
48. or/43-47 (3510)
49. 42 and 48 (7)
50. from 49 keep 1-7 (7)

Search strategy by PREMEDLINE

1. (vitamin\$ or mineral\$ or trace element\$ or micronutrient\$).tw. (2079)
2. (immunity or immune or immunology\$ or infection\$).tw. 9918)
3. (elderly or old\$ people\$ or old person\$).tw. (1394)
4. 1 and 2 and 3 (4)
5. from 4 keep 1-4 (4)

Search strategy - database: EBM reviews - ACP Journal club  
<1991 to September/October 2001>

1. [exp vitamin/] (0)
2. vitamin\$.tw. (91)
3. [micronutrients/] (0)
4. or/1-3 (91)
5. [exp trace elements/] (0)
6. trace element\$. Tw. (3)
7. [antioxidants/] (0)
8. antioxidant\$.tw (26)
9. retinal.tw. (5)
10. [exp ascorbic acid/] (0)
11. ascorbic acid.tw. (4)
12. tocopherol\$.tw. (9)
13. menadione.tw. (0)
14. menaquinone.tw. (0)
15. cobalt.tw. (0)
16. copper.tw. (3)
17. fluoride.tw. (7)
18. fluorine.tw. (0)
19. iodine.tw. (14)
20. iron.tw. (21)
21. manganese.tw. (0)
22. zinc.tw. (11)
23. selenium.tw. (7)
24. molybdenum.tw. (0)
25. chromium.tw. (0)
26. silicon.tw. (0)
27. [exp minerals/] (0)

28. mineral\$.tw. (40)
29. or/5-28 (111)
30. [eating/] (0)
31. [food/] (0)
32. food.tw. (95)
33. [exp diet/] (0)
34. or/30-33 (95)
35. 29 and 34 (14)
36. 4 or 35 (95)
37. [exp aged/] (0)
38. elderly.tw. (212)
39. old\$ person\$.tw. (42)
40. old\$ people\$.tw. (2)
41. or/37-40 (228)
42. 36 and 41 (14)
43. [exp infection/] (0)
44. infection\$.tw. (364)
45. [exp immunity/] (0)
46. [exp immune system/] (0)
47. (immunity or immune or immunology\$). Tw. (106)
48. or/43-47 (397)
49. 42 and 48 (2)
50. [from 49 keep 1-7] (0)
51. from 49 keep 1-2 (2)

---

**Search 5. Koning S, Verhagen AP, Suijlekom-Smit LW, Morris A, Butler CC, van der Wouden JC. Interventions for impetigo. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Review* 2004; Issue 2, CD003261.**

1. RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL.pt.
2. CONTROLLED CLINICAL TRIAL.pt.
3. RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS/
4. RANDOM ALLOCATION/
5. DOUBLE-BLIND METHOD/
6. SINGLE-BLIND METHOD/
7. OR/1-6
8. HUMAN.sh.
9. 7 AND 8
10. CLINICAL TRIAL.pt.
11. EXP CLINICAL TRIALS/
12. (CLIN\$ ADJ25 TRIAL\$). ti,ab.
13. ((SINGL\$ OR DOUBL\$ OR TREBL\$ OR TRIPL\$) ADJ 3 (BLIND\$ OR MASK\$)). ti,ab.
14. PLACEBOS/
15. PLACEBO\$.ti,ab.
16. RANDOM\$.ti,ab.

17. RESEARCH DESIGN/
18. OR/9-17
19. COMPARATIVE STUDY.sh.
20. EXP EVALUATION STUDIES/
21. FOLLOW UP STUDIES.sh.
22. PROSPECTIVE STUDIES.sh.
23. (CONTROL\$ OR PROSPECTIV\$ OR VOLUNTEER\$).ti,ab.
24. OR/18-23
25. LIMIT 24 TO HUMAN
26. STAPHYLOCOCCAL SKIN INFECTIONS/
27. IMPETIGO/
28. IMPETIGO.ti,ab.
29. PYODERMA.ti,ab.
30. OR/26-29
31. 30 and 25

---

**Search 6. Bellamy N, Campbell J, Robinson V, Gee T, Bourne R, and Wells G. Intraarticular corticosteroid for treatment of osteoarthritis of the knee. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Review* 2005; Issue 2, CD005328.**

- 1 osteoarthritis.tw,sh.
- 2 knee joint/
- 3 knee.tw,sh.
- 4 1 and (2 or 3)
- 5 osteoarthritis, knee/
- 6 4 or 5
- 7 exp osteoporosis/
- 8 osteoporos#.tw.
- 9 bone density/
- 10 bone desit\$.tw.
- 11 bone mineral.tw.
- 12 osteopenia.tw.
- 13 bone loss\$.tw.
- 14 or/7-11
- 15 Plus Cochrane study filter

---

**Search 7. Smucny J, Fahey T, Becker L, Glazier R, and McIsaac W. Antibiotics for acute bronchitis. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2000; Issue 4, CD000245.**

- 1 RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL.pt.
- 2 CONTROLLED CLINICAL TRIAL.pt.
- 3 RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS.sh.
- 4 RANDOM ALLOCATION.sh.
- 5 DOUBLE BLIND METHOD.sh.
- 6 SINGLE-BLIND METHOD.sh.
- 7 or/1-6

8 (ANIMAL not HUMAN).sh.  
 9 7 not 8  
 10 CLINICAL TRIAL.pt.  
 11 exp Clinical Trials/  
 12 (clin\$ adj25 trial\$).ti,ab.  
 13 ((singl\$ or doubl\$ or trebl\$ or tripl\$) adj25 (blind\$ or mask\$)).ti,ab.  
 14 PLACEBOS.sh.  
 15 placebo\$.ti,ab.  
 16 random\$.ti,ab.  
 17 or/10-16  
 18 17 not 8  
 19 9 or 18  
 20 exp BRONCHITIS/  
 21 acute bronchit\$.mp. [mp=title, abstract, cas registry/ec number word, mesh subject heading]  
 22 exp Respiratory Tract Infections/  
 23 or/20-22  
 24 exp ANTIBIOTICS, LACTAM/ or exp ANTIBIOTICS, COMBINED/ or exp ANTIBIOTICS, TETRACYCLINE/ or exp ANTIBIOTICS, AMINOGLYCOSIDE/ or exp ANTIBIOTICS, GLYCOPEPTIDE/ or exp ANTIBIOTICS, MACROLIDE/  
 25 19 and 23 and 24

---

**Search 8. Moore Z, Cowman S, Moore Z. Wound cleansing for pressure ulcers. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Review* 2005; Issue 4, CD004983.**

1. DETERGENTS explode all trees (MeSH)
2. SALINE SOLUTION HYPERTONIC explode all trees (MeSH)
3. POVIDONE-IODINE explode all trees (MeSH)
4. CHLORHEXIDINE explode all trees (MeSH)
5. HYDROTHERAPY explode tree 1 (MeSH)
6. ANTI-INFECTIVE AGENTS LOCAL explode all trees (MeSH)
7. DISINFECTION explode all trees (MeSH)
8. ALCOHOL DETERGENTS explode all trees (MeSH)
9. (clean\* or wash\* or scrub\*)
10. (wound\* near cleaning)
11. (shower\* or bath\*)
12. (detergent\* or saline or povidone or iodine or betadine)
13. (irrigat\* or whirlpool)
14. (chlorhexidine or hibitane or water or alcohol)
15. ANTI-INFECTIVE AGENTS LOCAL explode all trees (MeSH)
16. DISINFECTION single term (MeSH)
17. antiseptic\*
18. disinfectant\*
19. solution\*
20. soak\*

21. SODIUM HYPOCHLORITE explode all trees (MeSH)
22. SOLUTIONS single term (MeSH)
23. hypochlorit\*
24. eusol
25. dakin\*
26. (potassium next permanganate)
27. (gentian next violet)
28. (hydrogen next peroxide)
29. (benzoyl next peroxide)
30. (#1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11)
31. (#12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17 or #18 or #19 or #20)
32. (#21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25 or #26 or #27 or #28 or #29)
33. (#30 or #31 or #32)
34. DECUBITUS ULCER explode all trees (MeSH)
35. (decubitus near ulcer\*)
36. (bed near ulcer\*)
37. (pressure near ulcer\*)
38. (pressure near sore\*)
39. (bed near sore\*)
40. (#34 or #35 or #36 or #37 or #38 or #39)
41. (#33 and #40)

---

**Search 9. Banerjee S, Babidge W, Noorani HZ, Cuncins-Hearn A, Miller J, Smith J, Mensinkai S. Lung volume reduction surgery for emphysema [Technology overview no 17]. Ottawa: Canadian Coordinating Office for Health Technology Assessment; 2005.**

Pulmonary Emphysema!/de OR Emphysema!/de OR Emphysem?/ti,ab  
AND  
Surgery/de OR (Lung()volume()reduction()surger? OR LVRS OR  
Reduction()pneumoplast? OR Surger? OR pneumectom? OR lung(reduction()surger?)/  
ti,ab OR (Pulmonary AND (surger? OR resection? OR lobectom?))/ ti,ab OR  
(Lung()volume()reduction )/ti,ab AND (surgery/de OR surgery/ti,ab OR surgeries/ti,ab))  
AND  
dt=(meta-analysis OR controlled clinical trial OR randomized controlled trial OR  
multicenter study OR clinical trial OR clinical trial, phase i OR clinical trial, phase ii OR  
clinical trial, phase iii OR clinical trial, phase iv OR review OR review, multicase) OR  
(clinical trials! OR comparative study OR epidemiologic research design! OR  
epidemiologic studies! OR evaluation studies OR random allocation)/de OR (random?  
OR controlled()trial? OR controlled()clinical()trial? OR double()blind? OR single()blind?  
OR treble()blind? OR open()label()stud? OR open()label()trial? OR retrospective stud?  
OR prospective()stud? OR sham OR meta()analy? OR metaanaly? OR meta-analysis OR  
cohort()stud? OR case()control()stud? OR epidemiologic()stud? OR research()integration  
OR review? OR research()overview? OR quantitative()review? OR  
quantitative()overview? OR research()overview? OR methodologic()review? OR  
methodologic()overview? OR systematic()overview? OR systematic()review? OR

integrative()research OR quantitative()synthes?s OR comparative()stud? OR rct? ? or evidence-based medicine OR follow-up()stud? OR evaluation()stud? OR case()series OR case-series OR cross-over OR crossover OR multi-center OR multicenter OR multi-centre OR multicentre)/ti,ab

AND

Human? OR people? OR person?

---

**Search 10. Ho C, Tran K, Hux M, Sibbald G, Campbell K. Artificial skin grafts in chronic wound care: a meta-analysis of clinical efficacy and a review of cost-effectiveness [Technology report no 52]. Ottawa: Canadian Coordinating Office for Health Technology Assessment; 2005.**

S1 s (Skin Transplantation OR Skin(L)transplantation)/de

S2 s (Graft Rejection OR Graft Survival OR Transplantation Tolerance OR Transplants OR Transplantation OR Transplantation, Homologous! OR Transplantation, Heterologous)/de AND (Skin!/de OR (skin OR dermi? OR derma? OR epidermi? OR epiderma? OR keratinocyte?)/ti,ab)

S3 s (transplant? OR graft? OR autograft? OR allograft?)(n)(skin OR dermi? OR derma? OR epidermi? OR epiderma? OR keratinocyte?)/ti,ab

S4 s s1:s3

S5 s (Artificial Organs OR Bioartificial Organs OR Prostheses and Implants OR Absorbable Implants OR Implants, Experimental OR Tissue Engineering OR Tissue Culture)/de

S6 s (artificial? OR bio()artificial OR bioartificial OR bio()engineer? OR bioengineer? OR culture? OR equivalent? OR living()cell()composite? OR man()made OR replac? OR substitut? OR synthetic? OR tissue()engineer?/ti,ab)

S7 s5:s6

S8 s s4 and s7

S9 s Skin, Artificial/de

S10 s (Apligraf OR Dermagraft OR Epicel OR Graftskin OR OrCel OR INTEGRA OR TransCyte OR Epibase)/ti,ab

S11 s artificial(n)skin/ti,ab

S12 s s9:s11

S13 s s8 or s12

S14 s Single-Blind Method/de OR Double-Blind Method/de OR Meta-Analysis/de OR Random Allocation/de

S15 s dt=(Clinical Trial, Phase I OR Clinical Trial, Phase II OR Clinical Trial, Phase III OR Clinical Trial, Phase IV)

S16 s dt=(Clinical Trial OR Controlled Clinical Trial OR Meta-Analysis OR Multicenter Study OR Randomized Controlled Trial)

S17 s (Controlled Clinical Trials! OR Clinical Trials! OR Epidemiologic Research Design! OR Research Design!)/de

S18 s (Comparative Study OR Placebos)/de

S19 s (random? OR RCT? ? OR single()(blind? OR dumm? OR mask?) OR double()(blind? OR dumm? OR mask?))/ti,ab

S20 s (triple()(blind? OR dumm? OR mask?) OR treble()(blind? OR dumm? OR mask?))/ti,ab

S21 s (placebo? OR meta()analy? OR metaanaly? OR quantitative?()(review? OR overview? OR synthesi?) OR integrative()research OR research()integration)/ti,ab

S22 s (systematic?()(review? OR overview?) OR methodologic?()(review? OR overview?))/ti,ab

S23 s (clinical()(trial? OR study OR studies) OR multigent?(2n)(trial? OR study OR studies) OR multi()cent?()(trial? OR study OR studies))/ti,ab

S24 s (control?()(study OR studies OR trial?) OR crossover()(design OR study OR studies OR trial?))/ti,ab

S25 s (comparative()(trial? OR study OR studies))/ti,ab

S26 s (head()”to”(head OR off()label? OR follow()up))/ti,ab

S27 s s14:s26

S28 s (Comparative Study OR Epidemiologic Studies! OR Evaluation Studies! OR Morbidity! OR Mortality! OR Prognosis!)/de

S29 s (natural()history OR inception()cohort OR predict? OR prognos? OR outcome)/ti,ab

S30 s (case()control()(stud? OR trial?))/ti,ab OR (retrospective()(stud? OR trial?))/ti,ab  
OR  
(cohort()(stud? OR trial?))/ti,ab

S31 s (prospective()(stud? OR trial?))/ti,ab OR (observational()(stud? OR trial?))/ti,ab  
OR (follow()up()(stud? OR trial?))/ti,ab

S32 s s28:s31

S33 s s13 AND s27

S34 S S33/HUMAN

S35 s s34/1980:2004

S36 rd s35

S37 s s13 AND s32

S38 S S37/HUMAN

S39 s s38/1980:2004

S40 rd s39

---

Database: CINAHL <1982 to February Week 1 2004>

Search Strategy:

1 Skin Transplantation/

2 Dermatoplasty.ti,ab.

3 Transplantation/ or Organ Transplantation/ or exp Grafts/

4 exp Skin/ or (skin or dermi\$ or derma\$ or epidermi\$ or epiderma\$ or keratinocyte\$).mp.

5 3 and 4

6 ((transplant\$ or graft\$ or autograft\$ or allograft\$) adj (skin or dermi\$ or derma\$ or epidermi\$ or epiderma\$ or keratinocyte\$)).mp.

7 or/1-2,5-6

8 Artificial Organs/ or "Prostheses and Implants"/ or Tissue Culture/

9 (artificial\$ or (bio adj artificial) or bioartificial or (bio adj engineer\$) or bioengineer\$ or culture\$ or equivalent\$ or (living adj cell adj composite\$) or (man adj made) or replac\$ or substitut\$ or synthetic\$ or (tissue adj engineer\$)).ti,ab.

10 (or/8-9) and 7

11 Skin, Artificial/

12 (Apligraf or Dermagraft or Epicel or Graftskin or Or Cel or INTEGRA or TransCyte

or Epibase).ti,ab.  
13 (Artificial adj Skin).ti,ab.  
14 or/11-13  
15 10 or 14  
16 exp Experimental Studies/ or Meta Analysis/ or exp Clinical Research/  
17 Comparative Studies/ or Crossover Design/ or exp Professional Practice, Evidence-Based/ or exp Nonexperimental Studies/  
18 (Clinical trial or Systematic Review).pt.  
19 (((random\$ or RCT\$ or single) adj (blind\$ or dumm\$ or mask\$)) or (double adj (blind\$ or dumm\$ or mask\$))).ti,ab.  
20 ((triple adj (blind\$ or dumm\$ or mask\$)) or (treble adj (blind\$ or dumm\$ or mask\$))).ti,ab.  
21 (placebo\$ or (meta adj analy\$) or metaanaly\$ or (quantitative\$ adj (review\$ or overview\$ or synthesi\$)) or (integrative adj research) or (research adj integration)).ti,ab.  
22 ((systematic\$ adj (review\$ or overview\$)) or (methodologic\$ adj (review\$ or overview\$))).ti,ab.  
23 ((clinical adj (trial\$ or study or studies)) or (multicent\$ adj2 (trial\$ or study or studies)) or (multi adj cent\$ adj (trial\$ or study or studies))).ti,ab.  
24 ((control\$ adj (study or studies or trial\$)) or (crossover adj (design or study or studies or trial\$))).ti,ab.  
25 (comparative adj (trial\$ or study or studies)).ti,ab.  
26 ((head adj2 head) or (off adj label\$) or (follow adj up)).ti,ab.  
27 Review.pt.  
28 exp Morbidity/ or Mortality/ or Prognosis/ or Treatment Outcomes/  
29 ((natural adj history) or (inception adj cohort) or predict\$ or prognos\$ or outcome).ti,ab.  
30 ((case adj control adj (stud\$ or trial\$)) or (retrospective adj (stud\$ or trial\$)) or (cohort adj (stud\$ or trial\$))).ti,ab.  
31 ((prospective adj (stud\$ or trial\$)) or (observational adj (stud\$ or trial\$)) or (follow adj up adj (stud\$ or trial\$))).ti,ab.  
32 or/16-31  
33 15 and 32  
34 from 33 keep 1-127

# APPENDIX G: PRESS CHECKLIST

## PRESS Checklist

1. Translation: Is the search question translated well into search concepts?

Adequate

Needs revision Provide an explanation or example

---

---

2. Operators: Are there any mistakes in the use of Boolean or proximity operators?

Adequate

Needs revision Provide an explanation or example

---

---

3. Subject headings: Are any important subject headings missing or have any irrelevant ones been included?

Adequate

Needs revision Provide an explanation or example

---

---

4. Natural language: Are any natural language terms or spelling variants missing, or have any irrelevant ones been included? Is truncation used optimally?

Adequate

Needs revision Provide an explanation or example

---

---

5. Spelling & syntax: Does the search strategy have any spelling mistakes, system syntax errors, or wrong line numbers?

Adequate

Needs revision      Provide an explanation or example

---

---

6. Limits: Do any of the limits used seem unwarranted or are any potentially helpful limits missing?

Adequate

Needs revision      Provide an explanation or example

---

---

7. Adapted for db: Has the search strategy been adapted for each database to be searched?

Adequate

Needs revision      Provide an explanation or example

---

---

|

# APPENDIX H: SCREENSHOTS OF THE PEER REVIEW FORUM

Log-in Page - Microsoft Internet Explorer

Address: http://xp0558/press/login.aspx

Home  
Login

Home

- Upload/Download
- Change Password
- New Register

PRESS- Peer Reviewed Electronic Search Strategies

**Log In**

User Name:

Password:

Remember me next time.

[New Account?](#)  
[Forgot your password?](#)

Useful Links

Alex Korablin  
Business Analysis & WEB-Design

COPYRIGHT © 2006 PRESS

Question Statement - Microsoft Internet Explorer

Address: http://localhost:1981/press/secure\_members/all\_questions.aspx

Home > View Questions  
Logout

Home

- View Questions
- My Questions
- New Question
- Upload/Download
- Edit Profile
- Change Password
- New Register

Welcome Alex Korablin

Question	Answer	Time	Interface	Other	Email Address
<a href="#">test4</a>	No Answer	5days	Dialog	test4	<a href="mailto:aalkor@ua.fm">aalkor@ua.fm</a>
<a href="#">test3</a>	<a href="#">test3</a>	48hours	OVID		<a href="mailto:aalkor@ua.fm">aalkor@ua.fm</a>
<a href="#">test22222</a>	<a href="#">answer2</a>	48hours	OVID		<a href="mailto:aalkor@ua.fm">aalkor@ua.fm</a>
<a href="#">test question</a>	<a href="#">test answer</a>	48hours	OVID	test	<a href="mailto:akorablin@cheo.on.ca">akorablin@cheo.on.ca</a>

COPYRIGHT © 2006 PRESS