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Systematic Reviews

- A form of research synthesis that uses explicit, replicable methods to identify relevant studies and objective techniques to analyze those studies.

- Treats review process as a form of survey research and follows basic steps in research process:
  - Research reports, rather than people, are surveyed.
  - Each research report is “interviewed” by a coder who codes information and quantitative findings.

- Purpose is to sum up the best available research on a specific question in a way that reduces bias (Campbell Collaboration).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Systematic Review</strong></th>
<th><strong>Traditional Review</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>States a specific research question it seeks to answer</td>
<td>More generic in their purpose</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clear inclusion/exclusion criteria</td>
<td>Informal and subjective criteria for including studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparent and explicit search and retrieval strategy</td>
<td>Search and retrieval strategy not described/detailed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exhaustive search for studies, including gray literature</td>
<td>Often relies on convenience sample of studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Systematic coding and analysis of included studies</td>
<td>Subjective methods to collect and interpret information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Results presented in systematic fashion, statistical methods used to pool data and draw conclusions</td>
<td>Qualitative, narrative summaries of studies; may use “vote counts”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appraise the quality of the studies</td>
<td>Rarely appraise the quality of included studies</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Littell, Corcoran, & Pillai, 2008; Maynard, 2012)
Background

Educational reform context

+ Need for SMH to demonstrate contribution to academic outcomes
+ Need to include SMH in comprehensive school reform and turnaround strategies

Previous research

+ Schools and SMH practitioners can be interested in different outcomes (Academic v. psychosocial)
+ Limited SMH research on academic outcomes
  + Particularly for at-risk high school students (Hoagwood et al., 2007)
Purpose

To review existing research on the impact of early intervention SMH strategies on proximal and distal academic outcomes for at-risk, high school students.
Method

- Search in ERIC, PsychINFO, & Academic Search Complete
- Terms included those describing population, intervention, and outcomes
- Eligibility Criteria:
  - Design
  - Sample
  - Setting/time
  - Outcomes

**Identify Studies**: 3078 Articles

**Abstract Review**: 22 Articles

**Filtering**: 7 Articles

**Synthesis**
Implications

- Future research/collaborations
- Cross-disciplinary language barriers
- Identifying and measuring outcomes of interest across disciplines
Your Thoughts

Are systematic reviews helpful in advancing the field?

- What additional topics warrant review?
- Would MHEDIC be interested in taking this on?
  - How would we go about conducting systematic reviews collaboratively?

- How would we address the interdisciplinary needs for establishing a common language?