

## Assessing the roles and challenges of librarians in dental systematic and scoping reviews

Nena Schvaneveldt, AHIP; Elizabeth M. Stellrecht

### 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)

## REFERENCES

1. Nicholson J, McCrillis A, Williams JD. Collaboration challenges in systematic reviews: a survey of health sciences librarians. J Med Libr Assoc. 2017 Oct;105(4):385-93. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2017.176>.
2. Spencer AJ, Eldredge JD. Roles for librarians in systematic reviews: a scoping review. J Med Libr Assoc. 2018 Jan;106(1):46-56. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2018.82>.