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APPENDIX
Survey Instrument

1. Have you been involved in a dental (oral health, dentistry, dental hygiene, etc.) specific systematic or scoping review?
   □ Yes
   □ No

2. Are you a librarian or information specialist?
   □ Yes
   □ No

Demographics

3. How many years have you been a librarian or information specialist?
   □ 0–5
   □ 6–10
   □ 11–20
   □ >20

4. What kind of institution do you work in?
   □ Academic
   □ Association
   □ Hospital/clinic
   □ Other (please specify)

5. Where are you from?
   □ United States
   □ Canada
   □ Other (please specify)
Reviews involved in

6. How many non-dental systematic or scoping reviews have you been involved in, regardless of state of publication? [text entry]
7. How many dental systematic or scoping reviews have you been involved in, whether they were published or not? [text entry]
8. Of these dental systematic or scoping reviews, how many are still in progress (e.g., are in planning stages, searching, and/or data analysis is underway, etc.)? [text entry]
9. How many dental systematic reviews have you been involved in that were published or accepted for publication? [text entry]
10. How many dental scoping reviews have you been involved in that were published or accepted for publication? [text entry]
11. Of the dental systematic or scoping reviews you contributed to, how many were abandoned or never published? [text entry]
12. How many dental systematic or scoping reviews have you collaborated on (i.e., working longer-term with research team, engaging in a wide array of duties including database selection, search strategy, defining/refining topic, possibly acknowledged, but not credited as coauthor)? [text entry]
13. How many dental systematic or scoping reviews have you coauthored (i.e., worked in-depth with research team, developed strategy, written methods, credited with authorship)? [text entry]

Roles and challenges

What roles have you taken on in a dental systematic or scoping review? [Spencer and Eldredge, 2018] Select all that apply.

14. Planning and protocol
   - Clarifying what is involved in pursuing a systematic/scoping review
   - Question formulation
   - Guidance on selecting review methodology
   - Searching for similar or previous reviews/protocols on topic
   - Locating or recommending journals to publish manuscript
   - Protocol development
15. Information retrieval
   - Selecting databases and sources to search
   - Developing search strategy
   - Searching grey literature
   - Evaluation of search strategies

16. Managing results
   - De-duplication of search results
   - Documenting search results (e.g., for PRISMA diagram)
   - Consulting and recommending the use of software and tools (e.g., Covidence, Rayyan, nVivo)
   - Facilitating the use of systematic review software

17. Screening and data extraction
   - Title/abstract screening
   - Finding full text
   - Full text screening
   - Data extraction

18. Assessment
   - Quality assessment
   - Locating risk of bias tools
   - Conducting risk of bias assessment

19. Manuscript preparation
   - Writing methods section
   - Writing sections other than the methods section
   - Editing manuscript
   - Citation management
   - Other (please specify)

20. Which challenges have you encountered in conducting dental-specific systematic reviews? [Nicholson, McCrillis, and Williams, 2017]
    Select all that apply (questions 21–23).

21. Challenges involving the librarian/information specialist
   - I have inadequate training in systematic review methodology
   - Lack of my own confidence in my ability to construct a systematic/scoping review search
   - My lack of subject knowledge in dentistry
   - My lack of time to conduct a review
   - Lack of support from administration to develop my skills
22. Challenges involving individual researcher/team lead
- Researcher has inadequate training in systematic review methodology
- Researcher is not tracking reasons for exclusion
- Researcher expects librarians to provide only administrative tasks
- Researcher is not using two-step screening process (i.e., first reviewing title/abstract then full article)
- The researcher does not follow a data extraction plan
- Researcher does not want to evaluate study quality as part of process
- Researcher does not have inclusion/exclusion criteria established at the beginning of process
- Researcher does not follow systematic review methodology
- Researcher is not using two screeners
- A student is leading the project, and the student’s faculty mentor is not helpful
- Researcher refuses librarian credit for authorship

23. Challenges involving the entire team
- Lack of buy-in from other team members for librarian’s role
- Research team’s lack of time to conduct a review
- The research team is dysfunctional
- The research team cannot adhere to review’s overall time table
- The research team cannot agree on question
- The research team has too many members
- Research team misunderstands amount of time to conduct systematic/scoping review
- Research team misunderstands rigor of systematic/scoping reviews
- The research team has too few members
- General lack of resources to conduct a review (e.g., access to e-resources, software, etc.)
- Research question is defined too broadly
- Question is defined too narrowly (i.e., search retrieves too few results to draw a conclusion)
- Other (please specify)
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