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Introduction

How do you know if your library needs a systematic review service? Before putting time into developing a service, a needs assessment was carried out to examine Concordia University’s systematic and scoping review (SR) output.

Methodology

Searches were performed in 19 different databases to find SRs co-authored by Concordia affiliated researchers.

Search strategy (with no date limit):
Affiliation: (Concordia) AND Keyword: (“Systematic Review” OR “Scoping Review”)

Ross-White’s methodology[1] was used to determine the level of librarian involvement in each review. Both researchers examined the full text of each SR to classify librarian involvement as one of the following: Co-author, Acknowledgement or Unclear. Any conflicts were resolved through discussion between the researchers.

Results

There were 102 Concordia affiliated SRs from a variety of departments, most prominently Health, Kinesiology & Applied Physiology, Psychology, Education, and Management. A full-text analysis of 101 articles* revealed that 17 articles had librarian co-authors, 26 acknowledged a librarian and 58 did not mention librarians. Of the 17 articles with librarian co-authors, 9 were co-authored by a single individual at Concordia Library. Of those articles that acknowledged a librarian, 3 acknowledged librarians from Concordia Library.

Conclusion

The number of SRs (43) that acknowledged or were co-authored by librarians was not negligible and showcased evidence of a research culture at Concordia accepting of librarian involvement in SRs, indicating the potential for a service to be well received. At the same time, more than half of the articles (58) did not mention librarians. Creation of a service and outreach targeting departments with SR output may help increase collaboration with librarians in reviews authored by Concordia researchers.
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