

**Minutes of the  
Trial Search Co-ordinator Meeting  
11<sup>th</sup> Cochrane Colloquium, Barcelona  
26 October 2003**

Carol Lefebvre opened the meeting and all participants introduced themselves.

**1. At what stage should TSCs assist reviewers in developing their search strategy?**

There were different and strongly held opinions on whether the search should be developed before the Protocol is published. It was agreed that the preference of the TSCs present was that the option to do either should be explicitly stated in the Reviewers' Handbook.

**ACTION:** Carol to raise with the Handbook Advisory Group

**2. Copyright issues around downloading abstracts from MEDLINE, EMBASE, PsycINFO, CINAHL and other databases and submitting them to CENTRAL.**

Do you not submit those records at all or do you submit without abstracts and keywords?

Update Software has permission to download records from MEDLINE and the UKCC has permission to download records from EMBASE and include them with keywords and abstracts in CENTRAL. TSCs should not submit the abstract or keywords for inclusion in CENTRAL from any databases, unless they have negotiated rights with the copyright owners.

**3. Duplicates and journal titles in CENTRAL**

It was pointed out that variation in journal titles does not cause duplicates in CENTRAL as Update Software detects duplicates by comparing the title and year fields. A duplicate problem appears when you try to sort the database by journal name: the fact that the same journal is written in different ways (using different abbreviations or different full names) may cause confusion.

The best source of full journal names is Locator Plus; it was noted that full journal titles may not be unique as opposed to the formal abbreviations which are.

**4. Quality Advisory Group**

Steve asked the meeting what projects the group should undertake regarding trial search co-ordination and quality of reviews.

The reporting of search strategies was considered important, especially making sure that the date fields regarding searches on the cover sheet of the review are filled in.

TSC representatives on the RevMan Advisory Group reported that these dates had been the subject of discussion at a recent meeting and that in principle it had been decided to leave them out in a

future update of RevMan and replace them by one date: date search carried out. The TSC reps were requested to keep on eye this and report to the TSC list when more news appears on this.

**ACTION:** RevMan TSC reps

The Information Retrieval Methods Group and the Quality Advisory Group need volunteer TSCs to be involved.

It was pointed out that reviews should make it clear whether or not TSCs have been involved in a review. It was suggested that the Handbook should state that it is desirable that TSCs should be involved in the development of the search strategy for a review.

**ACTION:** Carol

## 5. The new Wiley interface

The following issues were discussed with respect to CENTRAL:

- Equivalent functionality
- Study based or report based
- Transfer of search strategies
- Requirement for advanced search features
- 

## 6. Egger HTA report

Comments to Carol.

7. Carol reminded the group that what TSCs want to know is often available in the CENTRAL Management Plan and the CLIB help files and release notes.
8. Carol pointed out that there is no TSC representative on the Modman Advisory Group (it has 6 RGC reps) and asked the meeting if they agreed we would propose to have a representative on that Committee. The meeting agreed. The meeting also agreed that Carol would propose Dymphna Hermans as TSC rep on the ModMan Advisory Committee. The meeting agreed.

**ACTION:** Dymphna.

9. Carol suggested that at their next meeting the CENTRAL Advisory Group discusses the way new members are recruited and whether or not there should be a term of office.

**ACTION:** Carol

10. TSCs were asked to give some thought to the next Colloquium in Ottawa and to whether or not TSCs should have dedicated time out at the RGC-TSC meeting.