



**Finnish Institute of
Occupational Health**

Review Project Management

or How to make a review

Jani Ruotsalainen

Overview



- Recruiting a team
 - Who is first author? (Has all the power!)
 - Aim for diversity of expertise
 - Explain what it means to write a Cochrane review
 - Don't forget responsibility for updating
- Project planning
 - Basically a breakdown of title, protocol, review with dates
 - COSH planning tool (tasks, people, deadlines, outcomes)
 - Maintain momentum
 - 40% of protocols never become reviews!!!
- Obtaining funding
 - A good plan is paramount

Different roles in a review team



Expertise needed in:

- Topic area: Disease/ intervention(s)/ population/ setting
 - Methodology (all finicky bits)
 - Statistics
 - Organisational skills
- Bare minimum is 2 authors
 - Need to have all of the above between them!
 - With every increase in number of authors:
 - comes a wider variety of roles, BUT
 - the importance of organisation grows

Even distribution of work?



Possible roles:

- Coordinator
- Work horse
- Math wiz
- Search expert
- Busy professor
- Etc...

Job descriptions:

Coordinator

- Project management
 - Planning, communication, review methods
- Study selection
- Data extraction
- Drafting text

Work horse (can be also topic expert)

- Study selection
- Data extraction
- Drafting text
- Management of references and studies

Math wiz/ Trials Search Coordinator/ etc.

- Input to specialist segments

Busy professor

- Comments here and there

Ways to organise a team



- Arrangements we've tried:
 - In-house 1st author + topic experts (e.g. dysphonia)
 - Outsourced topic expert 1st author + in-house 2nd author + topic experts (e.g. farm injuries)
 - Outside 1st author with ongoing protocol and own topic experts + in-house author added (e.g. alcohol & drug screening)
 - Participants' experiences?
- With great power comes great responsibility!
 - Balance of decision authority vs. work load
 - Leadership = organisational skills + inspiration
- Enthusiasm > commitment > work hours > a review?
 - Different with money as incentive?

Ways to organise the work



- To start with agree on expected:
 1. workload for each role
 2. approximate time table (at least until 1st major hurdle)
- CSR = roughly 3 months full working time over 2 years
- Using our planning check list
 1. Tasks: break down the project into small segments
 2. Person(s) in charge: assign tasks to people
 3. Deadlines: set arbitrary deadlines for tasks (+revise!)
 4. Outcomes: stay goal- NOT process-oriented

Software and online resources



- Things you can't do without:
 - E-mail and internet access
 - Cochrane Handbook: <http://www.cochrane-handbook.org/>
 - Review Manager 5: <http://www.cc-ims.net/RevMan>
 - Cochrane Style Guide: [download pdf here](#)
- Nice to have:
 - EndNote/ Reference Manager/ Procite (same for all authors)
 - a Dropbox account or similar for storing references
 - Excel or similar for book keeping + pivot tables in analysis
- Can also check out:
 - Online learning modules at: <http://training.cochrane.org/>

How about money then?



- Funders keen to see projects in terms of deliverables
- CSR projects can deliver three "products", i.e.:
 - a protocol
 - a review and
 - a journal article (easier to read ≠ duplication)
- Formulate funding application
 - based on 1) background as on title registration form, and 2) timetable for review completion in stages
 - include realistic estimates of working time per person

Summa summarum



- Very easy to get disheartened
 - e.g. searching + study inclusion = very time consuming
 - slow but steady is better than occasional sprints
 - "death" at the protocol stage = huge waste!
- Communicate like crazy!
 - remind people of agreed tasks and deadlines
 - maintain vision of continuous attainable steps
- Make use of available resources
 - Handbook and other guides, software, tutorials, etc.
 - people in the collaboration
 - money (nice but means Spartan discipline)

Thank you for your attention!

