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BACKGROUND

The Duke Medical Center Library & Archives comprehensive literature search service primarily focuses on expert searching and guidance on general evidence synthesis methodology. We have experienced an increase in the number of questions about quality assessment tools. Our practice is to suggest the most commonly used tools. However, teams sometimes reported these tools did not meet their needs. To solve this problem, we created a repository and finding aid of quality assessment tools. This allowed us to become more familiar with the array of tools available, along with their purposes and features, and ultimately was helpful for our research teams.

DESCRIPTION

To construct our repository we conducted a literature search for quality assessment and risk of bias tools. Data we collected for each tool was:

- Tool’s name
- Description
- Citation
- Intended use
- Whether it was validated
- Notable details

We included tools whose purpose was to evaluate the methodological quality or risk of bias of study designs. In most cases, we omitted critical appraisal tools, which we defined as anything that was designed solely to be used by clinicians or students to evaluate the quality of an article for class work or patient care. Our final product is a comprehensive, searchable table that is freely available on our systematic review services guide.

CONCLUSIONS

There are a wide variety of quality assessment and risk of bias tools available to meet most study designs. We continue to discover new tools as we interact with the evidence synthesis literature. Reporting guidelines such as STROBE, which are designed to aid in the reporting of research, and not specifically for quality assessment, were not added to the repository. It was frequently difficult to determine if a tool was validated, though many common tools have had their interrater-reliability tested.

Having a single searchable resource that captures the characteristics of a variety of tools can be a helpful for librarians or researchers conducting a systematic review outside their field of practice.

FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The authors intend to continually improve and update the repository with new tools and information.

The next planned step is to gather qualitative feedback from our researchers about their experience with the individual tools.
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