

12-20 Summary of Workshop & Discussion

Mr Andrew Booth & Professor Jane
Noyes, co-convenors of the Cochrane
Collaboration Qualitative Research
Methods Group

Controversies [Macro Level]

- **#1. Whether it should be done at all**
 - “like a dog's walking on his hind legs. It is not done well; but you are surprised to find it done at all”. *Dr Johnson*
- **#2. Whether different types of qualitative research can and should be combined**
- **#3. What the relationship is between quantitative and qualitative systematic reviews**
- **#4. What the place of theory is in qualitative systematic reviews – theory-generating or theory-driven**

Issues [Micro Level] - 1

- **#5. Whether it should start with a focused question**
- **#6. Whether it requires comprehensive literature searches**
- **#7. Whether literature searches can be iterative (rather than “big bang”)**
- **#8. Whether it requires critical appraisal/ quality assessment [hurdle/moderator]**
- **#9. Whether it requires use of critical appraisal checklists**

Issues [Micro Level] - 2

- **#10. Whether we know which type of synthesis to select and whether it matters**
- **#11. Whether we can integrate quantitative and qualitative approaches**
- **#12. When it is best to integrate quantitative and qualitative approaches**
- **#13. The extent to which the review team should be reflexive**
- **#14. The extent to which the end product can and should be reproducible**

Not answers, only more questions

- #1: Dixon-Woods, M. & Fitzpatrick, R. (2001) Qualitative Research in Systematic Reviews has Established a Place for Itself, *British Medical Journal* 323: 765–6.
- #2: Hawker, S et al (2002). Appraising the evidence: reviewing disparate data systematically. *Qualitative Health Research*; **12**: 1284-1299. and Oliver S et al (2005) An emerging framework for including different types of evidence in systematic reviews for public policy. *Evaluation*; **11**:446.
- #3: Mays N, Pope C, Popay J. (2005) Systematically reviewing qualitative and quantitative evidence to inform management and policy-making in the health field. *J Health Serv Res Policy*. **10** Suppl 1:6-20.
- #4: Pawson R (2002). Evidence-based policy. In search of a method (part 1) the promise of ‘realist synthesis’ (part 2). *Evaluation* 8(2): 157–81.

Not answers, only more questions

- #5 & #6 & #7: Dixon-Woods, Mary, et al (2004). How Can Systematic Reviews Incorporate Qualitative Research? A Critical Perspective. *Qualitative Research* 6.1 (2006): 27-44.
- #8: Dixon-Woods M et al (2004). The problem of appraising qualitative research. *Qual Saf Health Care*. 2004 Jun;13(3):223-5.
- #9: Dixon-Woods, M. et al (2007) Appraising qualitative research for inclusion in systematic reviews: a quantitative and qualitative comparison of three methods. *Journal of Health Services Research and Policy*, 12(1), 42-47.

Not answers, only more questions

- #10: Lucas PJ et al (2007). Worked examples of alternative methods for the synthesis of qualitative and quantitative research in systematic reviews. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 7:4. and Pope C, Mays N, Popay J. How can we synthesize qualitative and quantitative evidence for healthcare policy-makers and managers? *Healthc Manage Forum.* 2006 Spring;19(1):27-31.
- #11: Thomas J et al (2004). Integrating qualitative research with trials in systematic reviews. *BMJ.* 328(7446):1010-2.
- #12: Dixon-Woods M et al (2005). Synthesising qualitative and quantitative evidence: a review of possible methods. *J Health Serv Res Policy.* 2005 Jan;10(1):45-53.
- #13 & #14: Dixon-Woods M et al (2006). Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 6:35.

Workshop Discussion – What are
the main challenges in
developing and applying methods
for qualitative systematic
reviews?

Any other comments or
questions?