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Cochrane and Campbell Collaborations

The Cochrane Collaboration –
Working together to provide the best evidence for health care

The Cochrane Collaboration helps healthcare providers, policy makers, patients, their advocates and carers, make well-informed decisions about human health care by preparing, updating and promoting the accessibility of Cochrane Reviews.

http://www.cochrane.org/

The Campbell Collaboration –
What helps? What harms? Based on what evidence?

The Campbell Collaboration helps people make well-informed decisions by preparing, maintaining and disseminating systematic reviews in education, crime and justice, and social welfare.

http://www.campbellcollaboration.org/
Joint Symposium on Cochrane/Campbell Methods

Both Collaborations are dealing with very similar challenges … … but sometimes draw different conclusions!

- Fixed and random effects models (Julian Higgins & Larry Hedges)
  No clear answers on (i) number of studies needed to do meta-analysis, (ii) whether to use one model or the other despite sometimes stark differences in conclusions, (iii) suggestion to empirically examine both models and/or different weighting schemes in the same meta-analysis

- Assessment of funnel plot asymmetry and the potential impact of publication bias (Jonathan Sterne & Michael Borenstein)
  It’s not just about reporting bias: publication bias also applies to narrative reviews; important to consider likely impact of bias as (i) results remain essentially unchanged, (ii) effect size will shift but conclusions remain intact, (iii) conclusions could change; trim-and-fill method vs cumulative analysis

- Non-randomised studies (George Wells & Mark Lipsey)
  Special Issue of Research Synthesis Methods to be published in 2011; the designs to be included in a systematic review depend on the question asked: RCTs (efficacy or proof of concept) vs non-randomised studies (real-life); problems of bias compounded in non-randomised studies

Cochrane Public Health Review Group

Population-level interventions that address the social determinants of health and wellbeing

- Income distribution and financial interventions
- Education
- Public safety
- Housing and the built environment
- Employment and the work environment
- Social networks/support
- Food supply/access
- Transport
- Natural environment

http://ph.cochrane.org/
Cochrane Effective Practice and Organisation of Care (EPOC) Group

EPOC aims to undertake systematic reviews of interventions to improve health care delivery and health care systems including:

- Professional interventions (e.g. continuing medical education, audit and feedback)
- Financial interventions (e.g. professional incentives)
- Organisational interventions (e.g. the expanded role of pharmacists)
- Regulatory interventions

Editorial base – Ottawa
Satellites – Oslo, Melbourne, Oxford
- 65 reviews, 44 protocols
- collaborating with over 300 researchers globally

http://epoc.cochrane.org/

Cochrane/Campbell Equity Methods Group

The Campbell and Cochrane Equity Methods Group aims to develop methods to improve the relevance and quality of systematic reviews for policy-making, by developing explicit methods for considering equity effects. The Equity Group also develops criteria for when these methods should be applied.


http://equity.cochrane.org/