

ES97FA3

Interim Group Project Report 6000 words excluding figures

This project consists in performing a literature review with meta-analysis on a chosen healthcare technology (to be agreed with the Module Leader).

The students are expected to work together in order to:

- 1) Define the exact research question;
- 2) Define inclusion/exclusion criteria;
- 3) Perform a systematic search on relevant repositories of scientific articles;
- 4) Select relevant entries (i.e. titles and abstracts);
- 5) Independently (each student) exclude those not relevant according to the inclusion/exclusion criteria and then discuss discrepancies, if any, in order to find consensus;
- 6) Download and study the shortlisted papers;
- 7) Extract relevant outcomes;
- 8) Pool the results using a software tool for meta-analyses;
- 9) Write a report presenting the results, using relevant plots as required (e.g. funnel plot, forest plot etc.);
- 10) Discuss the results and potential biases against the existing literature.

Submission

Your submission should be prepared using the Arial font (minimum size 10pt) in a **single-column** format and **must not exceed 6000 words** (excluding title, abstract, figures, references and appendix). The appendix should only be used to provide additional information, which might be helpful but not essential for the report.

The report must be submitted electronically via Tabula before the end of Thursday in (Academic) Week 23 (8th of March 2018). You are reminded to ensure that your submission is of an appropriate file size. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that files are submitted satisfactorily.

Assessment Criteria

The report will be judged according to:

- 1) Systematic literature review report quality and relevance (70%):
 - a. Is the review based on a focused question that is adequately formulated and described?
 - b. Were eligibility criteria for included and excluded studies well predefined and specified?
 - c. Did the literature search strategy use a comprehensive, systematic approach?
 - d. Were titles, abstracts, and full-text articles dually and independently reviewed for inclusion and exclusion to minimize bias?
 - e. Was the quality of each included study rated independently by two or more reviewers using a standard method to appraise its internal validity?
 - f. Were the included studies listed along with important characteristics and results of each study?
 - g. Was publication bias assessed?
 - h. Was heterogeneity assessed?
- 2) Presentation (30%)
 - a. Report well structured
 - b. Tables and figure well reported (i.e. clear and univocally numbered captions, all the units have been specified, all the axis properly labelled, all the acronym properly explained etc.)
 - c. References well cited (student can choose any style as far as it is consistently maintained across the report)

Feedback

Students will receive via email detailed feedback from two independent reviewers, according to standard procedure used for IEEE journals. Students will receive exemplar from Module Leader previously published papers and a meeting with the Module Leader will be arranged in order to explain the received feedback.