

ONE

Introducing systematic reviews

David Gough, Sandy Oliver and James Thomas

Aims of chapter

This chapter:

- Introduces the logic and purpose of systematic reviews
- Explains their value for making decisions
- Considers what 'systematic' means when applied to reviewing literature
- Explains how review methods may vary while being systematic
- Introduces some of the current debates
- Explains to readers what to expect from the rest of the book

The role of research reviews

Research can be understood as systematic investigation to develop theories, establish evidence and solve problems. We can either undertake new research or we can learn from what others have already studied. How, then, do we go about finding out what has already been studied, how it has been studied, and what this research has found out?

A common method is to undertake a review of the research literature or to consult already completed literature reviews. For policy-makers, practitioners and people in general making personal decisions, engaging with mountains of individual research reports, even if they could find them, would be an impossible task. Instead, they rely on researchers to keep abreast of the growing

literature, reviewing it and making it available in a more digestible form. This book is an introduction to the range of approaches and methods for undertaking such reviews. These range from reviews of statistical data in order to answer questions about what interventions are effective to reviews of more qualitative research trying to develop new theories and concepts. We define a systematic review as ‘a review of research literature using systematic and explicit, accountable methods’.

Reviewing evidence, and synthesising findings, is something that we do all the time when going about our daily lives. For example, consider the range of activities involved in buying a new car. We approach the problem with an overarching question: ‘which car shall I buy?’ that can be broken down into a series of questions including: ‘what cars are available?’; ‘what type of car do I need?’; ‘which cars can I afford?’; and, if manufacturers’ marketing departments are doing their job, ‘which car will make me happy?’. We then gather data together to help us make our decision. We buy car magazines, read online reviews, talk to people we know and, when we’ve narrowed our options down a little, visit car showrooms and take some cars out for a test drive. We critically review the evidence we have gathered (including our personal experience) and identify possible reasons for doubting the veracity of individual claims. If we’ve decided that we need a small, cheap car, for example, we will understand that the conclusions of a review written by people who like to drive the latest sports cars may be less useful than a review written for the ‘thrift supplement’ of a weekend newspaper. We may prioritise particular characteristics, such as reliability or boot space, above others, such as fuel economy or safety, and attempt to identify reviews which assess cars with similar requirements to our own.

The example above, while simple compared to the many very complex decisions made in life, introduces us to the purpose of reviews and some of the key issues that we need to grapple with while undertaking a review. Starting our product research by relying first on what other people have written gives us access to a wide range of ideas about how to judge cars, more evidence than we could collect ourselves and more confidence in our conclusions, and leaves us with a smaller task when it comes to visiting showrooms or test driving cars. Our ‘decision question’ drives what we are doing (‘which car shall I buy?’) and all the other decisions and judgements we make are based on the need to answer this question. We are faced with many different possible answers (e.g. the make, model and optional extras of our car) and a mass of evidence that purports to answer our question. We need to come to an overall understanding of how this heterogeneous set of data is able to help us come to a decision and, in order to do this, we need to understand why the data are heterogeneous. In the example above, reviews of the same cars come to different conclusions because the people conducting them have different perspectives, priorities and understandings about what they understand the ‘best’ car to be. In the same way, reviews often depend on judgements, not only about the methodological

quality of research (was it well conducted?), but also its relevance to answering the question at hand.

Our experience as reviewers of research is that there are very many excellent studies published in the social science and health research literatures. However, there are also many studies that have obvious methodological or conceptual limitations or do not report adequate detail for their reliability to be assessed. Even where a study is well conceived, executed and reported, it may by chance have found and reported atypical findings and so should not be relied upon alone. For all these reasons, it is wiser to make decisions on the basis of all the relevant – and reliable – research that has been undertaken rather than an individual study or limited groups of studies. If there are variations in the quality or relevance in this previous research, then the review can take this into account when examining its results and drawing conclusions. If there are variations in research participants, settings or conceptualisations of the phenomena under investigation, these also can be taken into account and may add strength to the findings (please also see Chapter 8 for a discussion of these issues).

While primary research is essential for producing much crucial original data and insights, its findings may receive little attention when research publications are read by only a few. Reviews can inform us about what is known, how it is known, how this varies across studies, and thus also what is not known from previous research. It can therefore provide a basis for planning and interpreting new primary research. It may not be a sensible use of resources and in some cases it may be unethical to undertake research without being properly informed about previous research; indeed, without a review of previous research the need for new primary research is unknown. When a need for new primary research has been established, having a comprehensive picture of what is already known can help us to understand its meaning and how it might be used.

In the past, individuals may have been able to keep abreast of all the studies on a topic but this is increasingly difficult and (as we shall see in the next section) expert knowledge of research may produce hidden biases. We therefore need reviews because:

- 1 Any individual research study may be fallible, either by chance, or because of how it was designed and conducted or reported.
- 2 Any individual study may have limited relevance because of its scope and context.
- 3 A review provides a more comprehensive and stronger picture based on many studies and settings rather than a single study.
- 4 The task of keeping abreast of all previous and new research is usually too large for an individual.
- 5 Findings from a review provide a context for interpreting the results of a new primary study.
- 6 Undertaking new primary studies without being informed about previous research may result in unnecessary, inappropriate, irrelevant, or unethical research.

Systematic, traditional and expert reviews

It has become clear that, when intervening in people's lives, it is possible to do more harm than good (Chalmers 2003) (see Box 1.1). Examining existing research is one way of reducing the chances of doing this. As reviews of such research are increasingly used to inform policy and practice decisions, the reliability of these reviews is critically important. Methodological work on reviewing over the past two decades has built up a formidable empirical basis for reviewing health care evaluations and systematic reviews have therefore become established as a key component in evidence-informed decision-making. So influential has the use of research through systematic reviews become that their development can be considered to be one of the turning points in the history of science:

This careful analysis of information has revealed huge gaps in our knowledge. It has exposed that so-called 'best practices' were sometimes murderously flawed; and by doing nothing more than sifting methodically through pre-existing data it has saved more lives than you could possibly imagine.¹

The logic of reviewing is thus twofold: first, that as the opening section discussed, looking at research evidence is a useful thing to do; and second, that as reviews inform decisions that affect people's lives, it is important that they be done well. This book uses the term 'systematic review' to indicate that reviews of research are themselves pieces of research and so need to be undertaken according to some sort of method.

Box 1.1

Examples: Decisions not informed by research

Expert advice: Dr Benjamin Spock's advice to parents was to place infants on their fronts to sleep – advice not supported by research. When this policy was reversed, rates of sudden infant death dropped dramatically (Chalmers 2001).

Expert panel: In the BSE (mad cow) crisis in the UK in the late twentieth century where there were many deaths from eating infected meat and '...highly problematic policy decisions were often misrepresented as based on, and only on, sound science' (van Zwanenberg and Millstone 2005).

Well-intentioned interventions: In the Scared Straight programme criminals give lectures to 'at risk' youth about the dangers of a life of crime, but this is statistically associated with higher not lower rates of crime in the at-risk youth (Petrosino et al. 2002).

Reviewing research systematically involves three key activities: identifying and describing the relevant research ('mapping' the research), critically appraising research reports in a systematic manner, and bringing together the findings into a coherent statement, known as synthesis (see Box 1.2 for definitions). As with all pieces of research, there is an expectation that the methods will be explained and justified, which is how we reach our definition that a systematic review of research is a review of research literature using systematic and explicit, accountable methods.

Most literature reviews that were carried out a decade or more ago were contributions to academic debates, think pieces, not done in a systematic way. Reviewers did not necessarily attempt to identify all the relevant research, check that it was reliable or write up their results in an accountable manner.

Traditional literature reviews typically present research findings relating to a topic of interest. They summarise what is known on a topic. They tend to provide details on the studies that they consider without explaining the criteria used to identify and include those studies or why certain studies are described and discussed while others are not. Potentially relevant studies may not have been included because the review author was unaware of them or, being aware of them, decided for reasons unspecified not to include them. If the process of identifying and including studies is not explicit, it is not possible to assess the appropriateness of such decisions or whether they were applied in a consistent and rigorous manner. It is thus also not possible to interpret the meaning of the review findings.

Box 1.2

Key definitions

Systematic: undertaken according to a fixed plan or system or method

Review: a critical appraisal and analysis

Explicit: a clear, understandable statement of all the relevant details

Accountable: answerable, responsible and justified

Map (systematic): a systematic description and analysis of the research field defined by a review question

Synthesis: creating something new from separate elements

Systematic review: a review of the research literature using systematic and explicit accountable methods

¹BBC Radio 4, *Moments of Genius*: Ben Goldacre on systematic reviews. www.bbc.co.uk/radio4/features/moments-of-genius/ben-goldacre/index.shtml

The aim of reviewing systematically is to have such explicit, rigorous and accountable methods. Just as primary research is expected to report transparent, rigorous methods, the same standards can apply to systematic reviews. Just as primary research is undertaken to answer specific questions, reviews of existing research can be productively focused on answering questions rather than addressing topic areas. The focus on a question drives the choice of the methods to find the answers.

Individual experts or expert panels are often consulted to answer questions about what is known from research. Experts may of course have many specialist skills, including knowledge of research, practical experience of the phenomena being considered and human insight and implicit knowledge that have not been formalised in research. However, there are also dangers from this richness of knowledge not being explicit.

One danger is that the experts' ideological and theoretical perspectives, and thus the conceptual framework determining their assessment of the research, will not be explicit; and as with everyone, these perspectives may be influenced by personal interests in the issues being discussed. Second, the boundaries of the experts' knowledge may not be transparent; that is the boundaries of studies familiar to them and thus the evidence being considered. A third danger is that even if the boundaries of the studies are clear, the expert may know some of the studies within those boundaries better than others so not all of the research will have equal representation in the conclusions they draw. Fourth and fifth dangers are the related problems of how the experts assess the quality and appraise the relevance and then synthesise different pieces of evidence. Sixth, it may not be clear the extent to which the expert draws on other forms of knowledge, such as practice knowledge, in forming their overall conclusions. An expert witness in a court may, for example, provide an opinion that the court believes is based on research, but is in fact based on a mixture of research and practice wisdom. Seventh, the manner in which someone is assessed as being expert on a particular area may not be appropriate. They may not be expert at all on this topic, or they may be expert but their esteem and credibility is based on practice knowledge. A court may, for example, give high credibility to research reports from someone who has high esteem as a practitioner rather than as a researcher.

In many ways an expert review or expert panel is similar to a traditional literature review. There may be great insight and knowledge but with a lack of transparency about what this is or how it is being used. With experts and expert panels there may be a lack of clarity about the:

- perspective and conceptual framework, including ideological and theoretical assumptions and personal interest;
- inclusion criteria for evidence;
- nature of the search for evidence;
- sort of evidence that is thus being considered;
- quality and relevance appraisal of that evidence;

- method of synthesis of evidence;
- use of evidence other than research;
- basis for their expertise: (i) how their expertise is assessed; (ii) how its relevance to the topic in question is assessed; (iii) how its relationship to research skills and knowledge is assessed.

In order to address such issues, systematic reviews often proceed through a number of stages, as shown in Figure 1.1. We shall see in later chapters that these stages are an oversimplification, but they are sufficiently common for them to provide a guide to the part of the review process being discussed in each chapter.

Though the idea of systematic reviews is simple, and their impact profound, they are often difficult to carry out in practice, and precisely how they should be done is the subject of much debate and some empirical research. Identifying the relevant research, checking that it is reliable and understanding how a set of research studies can help us in addressing a policy or practice concern is not a straightforward activity, and there are many ways of going about reviewing the literature systematically. This book takes a careful look at how approaches differ (while still being systematic) and considers the issues involved in choosing between these different approaches.

Questions, methods and answers

Primary research asks many different questions from a variety of standpoints (Gough et al. 2009), and this richness of questions, approaches and research methods is also reflected in systematic reviews. If, for example, questions are asked about the meaning attached to different situations by different actors in society, then qualitative exploratory methods are likely to be appropriate. To find out how societal attitudes vary across the country, then a survey may be most helpful, whereas knowing how many people receive different state services may be found from routine government administrative data. To investigate whether a particular social intervention has had the required effect, an experimental study may be the most powerful method.

The idea that different research questions may be answered best by different methods and by different types of data also applies to reviews. For instance, systematic reviews addressing questions about the effects of health interventions have widely agreed systematic methods for setting the scope, judging the quality of studies, and presenting the synthesised findings, often using statistical meta-analysis of the results of randomised controlled trials (see, for example, Higgins and Green 2011). However, a systematic question-driven approach to reviews can apply equally to research questions of process or of meaning that are addressed by more qualitative primary research and by review methods that reflect those qualitative research approaches (see, for example, Patterson et al. 2001; Pope et al. 2007; Sandelowski and Barroso 2007).




Figure 1.1 Common stages in a systematic review

Reviews and their findings can vary on many different dimensions and these are discussed in detail in Chapter 3. The diversity of review methods we portray are a spectrum of methods spanning those reviews that aim to *aggregate* or ‘add up’ findings from multiple, similar studies and those reviews that aim to *configure* or ‘organise’ findings of studies (Sandelowski et al. 2006, 2011; Voils et al. 2008). Aggregative reviews often answer tightly specified questions using quantitative pre-specified methods to test theory using empirical observations (a deductive method). Reviews that take a configurative approach are more likely to ask more open questions that are answered with qualitative data and more iterative methods that interpret specific examples of things to address questions about experiences and meaning to generate and explore theory (an inductive method). Many reviews include some aggregation and some configuration. Reviews need to specify the questions they are

asking and the methods used to address these, and this is often written as a 'protocol' prior to undertaking the review.

Box 1.3

Key definitions

Quantitative research: the systematic empirical investigation of quantitative properties of phenomena and their relationships. Quantitative research often involves measurement of some kind.

Qualitative research: in-depth enquiry in order to understand the meaning of phenomena and their relationships.

Aggregative reviews: reviews where the synthesis is predominantly aggregating (adding up) data to answer the review question. Aggregative reviews commonly use quantitative data but qualitative data can also be aggregated.

Configurative reviews: reviews where the synthesis is predominantly configuring (organising) data from the included studies to answer the review question. Configurative reviews commonly use qualitative data but quantitative data can also be configured. Aggregation and configuring fall on a continuum and all reviews are likely to be both aggregating and configuring data to some extent.

Protocol: a statement of the approach and methods to be used in a review made prior to the review being undertaken.

With these complex choices about review methods, it is important for reviewers to have a clear understanding of the 'meaning' of the question. For example, the starting point for a review might be, 'We want to know about the effects of classroom teaching assistants'. Further discussion may clarify that this question could be more precisely framed to indicate the more specific question being asked and then the type of synthesis that would be most appropriate, for example:

- 'Do students in classes where there is a classroom teaching assistant get higher or lower scores on test scores?' The most appropriate synthesis method is probably aggregative quantitative, preferably meta-analysis (if the primary research meets the necessary conditions).
- 'How can we conceptualise the way that the presence of classroom assistants changes relationships between students and teachers and between teachers in class?' The most appropriate synthesis method is probably configurative (if the primary research meets the necessary conditions).

Once the meaning of the question is clear, the appropriate method can be chosen. Although it may seem a simple task to match methods to question types, the reality is more complex. A question may be answered in more than one way. The selection of the appropriate method for a review depends on the type of question to be answered, but also has to consider the use to which the review will be put,

and practical issues, such as the experience and perspective of the review team (see Chapter 4). Also, reviews vary in how extensive the review question is (the breadth of question and the depth in which it is examined) and in the time and resources used to undertake it (see Chapter 3).

Challenges and critiques for systematic reviewing

Systematic reviewing has only recently become a major area of methodological development. Although the idea of being more explicit about reviewing research is not new, it was only in the 1980s that some of the texts on some of the major types of review, such as statistical meta-analysis (Glass et al. 1981) and meta-ethnography (Noblit and Hare 1988), were published (these types of review are explained later in the book, particularly in Chapters 3 and 9). Although reviews of literature have been advocated for very many years (Bohlin, in press; Chalmers et al. 2002), systematic reviewing is still a young and rapidly developing field of study and methods of reviewing have not yet been developed for all areas of science. It is an exciting time yet there are many challenges to be overcome (Oakley et al. 2005).

First, there are many conceptual and methodological challenges. This book discusses a wide range of approaches to reviewing from an equally broad range of different epistemological positions. In it we argue that this range of methods is useful, but we realise that this diversity raises many complex issues, particularly in relation to mixing results from different research traditions. Related to the conceptual challenges are more detailed methodological issues. While there is a strong empirical base underpinning some review methods, many have been designed and developed based on primary research methods and on the logic of systematic reviews, with comparatively little methodological study of the impact of different approaches to particular aspects of reviewing – such as search strategies and data coding. In a sense, the methods of evidence-informed policy and practice are not always evidence informed. We need more empirical data to support the selection of individual review methods.

A second challenge, and related to the methodological issue, is the lack of an agreed terminology to describe, discuss and develop methods (Gough et al., in press). Some of this linguistic confusion arises from fundamental debates about the nature of knowledge and the role of research in this. Some of the confusion is a lack of clarity about widely-used but unclear distinctions, such as quantitative and qualitative research. There are, however, many further problems in the terminology used for reviews of research evidence.

The term ‘meta’ is one such confusing word. Meta has many meanings and in relation to research it is often used to mean ‘about’ or ‘beyond’ and so ‘meta-evaluations’ are ‘evaluations of evaluations’. Such meta-evaluations can be a form of systematic review, but they can also be simply the evaluation of the quality of one or more evaluations (Gough et al. in preparation). The term ‘meta-analysis’ can mean analysis

of analysis and so can be another term for systematic review, but meta-analysis has been used so often to refer to statistical reviews that it has become synonymous with statistical synthesis. A 'meta-review', on the other hand, is a review of ('about') reviews, of which there are several forms (see Chapter 3). Also, many words used in reviewing can give the impression that a particular type of review is being assumed. Words such as 'protocol' (methods of a review) suggest pre-specified methods and even the word 'synthesis' may suggest aggregation to some people and the configuring of findings to others (see Chapter 3 on dimensions of difference in reviews).

Box 1.4

Key definitions

Meta: about or beyond something.

Meta-evaluation: evaluation of evaluations. These can be systematic reviews; alternatively they can be formative or summative evaluations of evaluations, including standards for such evaluations.

Meta-analysis: usually 'statistical meta-analysis of data from primary research studies', though the term can refer to all forms of review.

Review of reviews: a review of previous reviews. This is in contrast to reviews that only review primary research studies.

A third challenge relates to resource constraints. Reviews are major pieces of research and require time and other resources. The resources available will impact on the type of review that can be undertaken. More fundamentally, there is the extent of investment by society in reviews of research. This is not just an issue of overall funding for research, but the balance of investment between primary research and reviews of what is known from that primary research. Currently, the funding of reviews is minimal compared to the funding of primary research.

The most appropriate balance between primary research and reviews is difficult to specify but is likely to vary for different funders, producers and users of research. A research institute closely related to policy or practice decision-makers, for example, would be particularly likely to have a high balance of reviews to primary research. The challenge for all the individuals and organisations involved in research is to consider whether their needs, roles and responsibilities are best met by the current balance they take between primary research and reviews of that research.

A fourth challenge is the capacity constraints in terms of individual and organisational skills and infrastructure to undertake reviews. There are relatively few people with advanced review skills and so even if funding was available, it would take time to build up the necessary capacity.

Fifth are the capacity constraints for using reviews. This not only involves the capacity to read and understand reviews, but also the capacity to interpret and

apply reviews in meaningful and useful ways. Reviews of research are only part of the research generation and use cycle. The cycle cannot work effectively without the links between research and the users of research and this may require further intermediary processes and intermediary organisations (Gough et al. 2011; and see Chapter 10). If formal processes are required to be explicit about ideological and theoretical perspectives and methods in the production of knowledge, then maybe more formal processes are required for some of the uses of knowledge.

Sixth are broader political challenges. There are many critics of systematic reviews. One criticism is the mistaken belief that systematic reviews are only concerned with questions of studies of effectiveness and so represent an empiricist (or positivist) research paradigm. In social science there are often strong views about the appropriateness of different research paradigms (Oakley 2000a, 2000b) and some argue that the empiricist paradigm is deficient, making systematic reviews deficient too. However, as has already been explained in this chapter, the logic of reviews can apply to many questions and methods, not only empirical statistical reviews; meta-ethnography, for example, was introduced as a method in the late 1980s (Noblit and Hare 1988). Moreover, we argue that systematic reviews of effectiveness, framed with the help of stakeholders, are not deficient but important contributions to accumulating knowledge.

A related criticism is that the review process is atheoretical and mechanical and ignores meaning. This is another criticism of the empiricist paradigm where (in both primary research and reviews) a pre-specified empiricist strategy is used to test hypotheses such as the effectiveness of interventions. It is a criticism of a particular research paradigm and of the narrowness of some studies within that paradigm rather than of systematic reviews. The preference of one research paradigm over another or the existence of some poor quality primary research studies or systematic reviews is not an argument about the inherent appropriateness or importance of systematic reviews, and this book does not partake in these wars between different research paradigms. Decision-makers at various levels need to have different kinds of research questions addressed in order to inform the formulation of policy or practice and to implement change, and so the authors of this book value a plurality of perspectives, research questions and methods and thus also of review questions and methods (Oakley 2000a, 2000b). We value theory-testing reviews asking questions of effectiveness that aggregate findings and we also value reviews that configure and develop and critique concepts and ideas.

Another criticism is that reviews often only consider relatively few studies and thus are ignoring much relevant research. There are at least two issues here. First, many reviews have narrow review questions and so narrowly define the boundaries (inclusion criteria) of the studies they consider and so their conclusions must be limited to research so defined. This needs to be explicit in the title, introduction and summary of a review to avoid misrepresenting the data on which it was reaching its conclusions. The review needs to state what it is not including and thus what it is not studying. A review that was titled 'the importance of X for Y' which only considered a few aspects of X and Y could rightly be criticised for misrepresentation or bias.

The criteria for the inclusion and exclusion of studies can include such things as the topic focus, the method of primary research and the quality of the research. Researchers, as with different perspectives and working within different research paradigms, will have different views of what constitutes good quality and relevant evidence. This is the nature of academic discourse and occurs just as much in primary research as with research reviews. With reviews the argument is being played out at a meta-level rather than in discussing individual studies. Reviews allow broader discussions with explicit assumptions and leveraging many studies rather than debates about individual studies.

The second issue in relation to the low numbers of studies in some reviews is concerned with the inefficient process of searching for studies on electronic databases. Many irrelevant studies have to be sifted through in order to find the few that are on topic. Reports of reviews will include the number of studies found in the search, which may be very many thousands of which only a few may actually be relevant. Critics use those numbers of discarded studies to argue that studies are being ignored. What is being ignored here, however, is that electronic searching is imprecise and captures many studies that employ the same terms without sharing the same focus. These extraneous studies need to be excluded after the electronic searching is completed. In sum, there are two related issues: what is the focus of a review and what number of studies will help in addressing that focus?

A broader and potentially more powerful criticism is that systematic reviews appeal to government because they fit with a new managerialism for controlling research. The state can specify what research it wants and how this should be reviewed and thus control the research agenda and the research results. The overt process of setting review questions in discussion with a range of different users safeguards against any such concern. Researchers and research funders are in a very strong position to determine the nature and outcome of research. Involving a broader range of users in defining reviews of what we know, what we don't know and what more we want to know, can give voice to others in society and make research more not less democratic (Gough and Elbourne 2002; Gough 2007a, 2011; and see Chapter 2). Being more explicit about the personal and political in research and increasing the potential for the increased involvement of different sections of society nationally and internationally is an important goal for systematic reviews.

Systematic reviews have an integral role in the production of research knowledge and are an essential part of the process of interpreting and applying research findings to benefit society. Systematic reviews play a key part in developing future primary research and in advancing methods that better achieve their purpose – so-called 'fit for purpose' research methods. They provide a potential means by which all voices in society can engage in determining research agendas.

We cannot predict all the possible roles that systematic reviews will fulfil in the future, but some ideas about methodological and societal issues relating to reviews already on the horizon are discussed in Chapter 11.

The aims of this book

This book provides an introduction to the logic of systematic reviews, to the range of current and developing methods for reviewing, and to the consequences of reviewing systematically for the production and use of research. There are many excellent books available on different types of systematic review. This book differs from most others currently available in examining the nature of the basic components of all reviews driven by any research questions and including any research methods and types of data.

It examines formal, explicit and rigorous methods for undertaking reviews of research knowledge. This idea of gathering research literature together is straightforward; the challenge is that research questions and methods are very diverse and so we need many different types of review addressing different questions using different types of research for different purposes. Understanding the complexities of reviewing research has practical relevance for using the messages that research offers, but its importance is greater than this.

The book has been designed as a resource for four main audiences. First, it is primarily a resource for those undertaking reviews. It does not provide a step-by-step guide for carrying out every stage of every possible type of review. Considering detailed methods of reviewing for all possible types of research question, ranging from measuring the effects of interventions to developing theory to understand how things can be best understood, would be too much for a single volume and sections would quickly become out of date as new insights are being published regularly. Instead, it aims to provide an explanation of the main issues encountered at different stages of different types of systematic reviewing, and thus the thinking behind the many decisions required in any review. As we shall see later in the book, reviews vary considerably in their questions and methods, and in their scope and purpose. An understanding of how the aims of a review can be achieved is the most fundamental requirement for being able to undertake a review or for using review findings appropriately.

Systematic reviews also raise issues about how primary research is undertaken, how different approaches and methods are fit for purpose, and the implications for what more needs to be known and how the gaps can be filled by primary research. The second audience for the book therefore consists of those who fund, plan or undertake primary research. Reviews tell us what we know and don't know in relation to a question, and how we know this. They also raise the issue of what future research might be, what we might know and how we might know it. The review process thus enables a consideration of what would be the appropriate, fit-for-purpose research strategies and methods to achieve specific research objectives. It also provides an opportunity for non-researchers to be involved in such processes; to consider the research to date and to participate in developing future research agendas.

The third audience for the book consists of those who may use reviews to inform decision-making. If decisions are being made on the basis of a review, and

yet reviews can vary considerably in terms of focus, question, purpose, method, data and rigour, then an understanding of these characteristics is important for interpreting the quality and relevance of that review for the decision-makers.

The fourth audience for the book will be those who have a wider interest in the production and use of research in society. In being question-driven, systematic reviews raise issues about the purpose of research and thus the drivers producing that research. They raise questions about whose questions are being asked and the methods being used to provide those answers. Reviews of research are driven by the needs of the different people asking these different questions, including all those who may use the research or other stakeholders affected by it. For this reason, reviews and their methods need to be relatively fit for achieving their intended purpose(s). These questions relate to fundamental issues about the funding and use of research and its role in society. They also relate to how reviews can be interpreted and applied in practice, thereby raising a whole range of issues about moving from knowledge to action, described in different ways as knowledge translation, knowledge mobilisation and exchange (see Chapter 10).

The book reflects the development of theory and practice at the EPPI-Centre where all of the authors do or, until recently, did work (Oakley et al. 2005). There is not an EPPI-Centre method for undertaking reviews; rather there are principles that guide our work. These include the following:

- 1 Both primary research and reviews of research are essential to progress research.
- 2 There is a wide range of review methods just as there is a wide range of primary research methods.
- 3 Reviews should follow the research method principles of quality, rigour and accountability that are expected in primary research.
- 4 Review methods often reflect the methods, epistemological assumptions and methodological challenges found in primary research.
- 5 Reviews should be driven by questions which may vary in many ways, including an ideological and a theoretical perspective.
- 6 Those asking questions of research are 'users' of that research, with particular perspectives and priorities that can usefully inform the process of undertaking primary and secondary (reviews of) research.

Conclusion

The starting point for the book is that research as systematic enquiry is an important form of knowledge and that we should balance the investment of resources and energy in new research with the reviewing of what we know from previous research. Traditionally, reviews have been undertaken without clear, formal, explicit and systematic methods, which undermines their status and usefulness as research, and similar arguments can be made about expert opinion (even if such opinion may have

great uses in other circumstances). Systematic reviews have common principles and similar processes, but can vary as much as primary research in terms of their extent, breadth and depth, and in types of question, data and method. Systematic reviews, like any form of research, can be undertaken well and badly, and so need appropriate quality assurance processes to evaluate them. To progress, systematic reviewers need to be aware of the many practical, methodological and political challenges involved in this work and their wider role in the production and use of research in society.