The Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions details the hallmarks of a successful systematic review, including “a clearly stated set of objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies; an explicit reproducible methodology; a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies that would meet the eligibility criteria; explicit and comprehensive assessment of quality in individual studies; and a systematic synthesis of the results of the individual studies.”

Table 1. Systematic Reviews Versus Traditional Narrative Reviews

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Systematic Reviews</th>
<th>Traditional Narrative Reviews</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purpose</td>
<td>To answer a clear question to be answered</td>
<td>To report on the studies found</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedure</td>
<td>Conducting preliminary MeSH searches</td>
<td>Searching for relevant studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Creating a scientifically rigorous, peer-reviewed, and reproducible process saves time, resources, and minimizes bias</td>
<td>Often do not consider differences in study results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a standardized approach for internal and external stakeholders provides a framework to ensure complete alignment of the analysis objectives</td>
<td>Inconsistent reports. Developing a standardized approach for internal and external stakeholders provides a framework to ensure complete alignment of the analysis objectives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Guidelines for conducting scientific literature analyses vary among organizations, resulting in incomplete or inconsistent guidance.</td>
<td>Guidelines for conducting scientific literature analyses vary among organizations, resulting in incomplete or inconsistent guidance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Deciding on review question Start with clear question to be answered or revised.</td>
<td>Deciding on review question Start with clear question to be answered or revised.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Developing a focused, scientifically sound product</td>
<td>Delivering a focused, scientifically sound product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Delivering a focused, scientifically sound product</td>
<td>Delivering a focused, scientifically sound product</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Medical Strategy, Medical Writing, and the Publications Department are involved in the entire literature review process, from initial search to final report.</td>
<td>Medical Strategy, Medical Writing, and the Publications Department are involved in the entire literature review process, from initial search to final report.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A protocol-driven search, defined at the outset of the study; and</td>
<td>A protocol-driven search, defined at the outset of the study; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evidence is evaluated for its scientific and clinical rigor, using the GRADE standardized evaluation criteria</td>
<td>Evidence is evaluated for its scientific and clinical rigor, using the GRADE standardized evaluation criteria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Several methods for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations</td>
<td>Several methods for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
<td>Conclusions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Purpose

The following search terms were utilized:

- “protocol-driven searches”
- “a clearly stated set of objectives with pre-defined eligibility criteria for studies; an explicit reproducible methodology; a systematic search that attempts to identify all studies that would meet the eligibility criteria; explicit and comprehensive assessment of quality in individual studies; and a systematic synthesis of the results of the individual studies”

Figure 1. The Medicine Group’s Literature Analysis Process

- The SOP defines the roles of individual cohorts throughout the literature review process.
- The SOP incorporates input from internal and external stakeholders throughout the literature analysis process.

Figure 2. Role of Each Department Throughout the Literature Review Process
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Figure 3. Quantitative Analysis of Predictive Findings

- The %AUC for predictive analysis is underestimated by the model’s information department, with the result of a conical study hypothesis. Key, question, and search outcomes.
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- Shojania KG, Guyatt GH, Cohen BI, et al., cited the median survival for relevance as 5.5 years and called for incorporating more recent data within updates are warranted. Although there is no standard timeframe for revisions to literature analyses, Shojania et al. suggested that updates occur on average every two to four years. See Figure 2 for the timeline. Conclusions
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