Asthma update 2018-19 Search Flow chart

Systematic Reviews – Key Questions 1-12

**KQ1**

- Initial Return = 2817
- Sifted results = 353

**Systematic reviews from sifted results = 19**

**SRs Selected by group = 17**

- 9 SR excluded:
  - 4 not relevant
  - 5 not a SR

**Additional searching for all study types**

- Initial return = 1030
- Sifted results = 18

- 6 papers selected by group

- 3 Obs papers rejected as not relevant

**Evidence Table**

- 8 SRs + 3 Obs studies
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 17

SRs Selected by group = 17

12 SRs excluded:
- 9 not relevant
- 3 not a SR

Additional searching for all study types
Initial return = 465
Sifted results = 33

29 papers selected by group

6 studies excluded as not relevant

Evidence Table
5 SRs + 23 Obs studies
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 3

SRs Selected by group = 2

2 SRs excluded as not relevant

Additional searching for all study types
Initial return = 965
Sifted results = 9

5 studies excluded:
- 4 included in a SR
- 1 not relevant

9 papers selected by group

Evidence Table
1 SR + 3 RCTs
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 15

SRs Selected by group = 15

Additional searching for all study types
Initial return = 324
Sifted results = 26

No additional studies selected by group

Evidence Table
9 SRs

6 studies were excluded:
- 5 not SRs
- 1 paper not available
Evidence Table
5 SRs + 2 RCTs
SRs Selected by group = 22

20 SRs excluded as not relevant

Additional searching for RCTs
Initial return = 364
Sifted results = 25

RCTs Selected by group = 12

12 excluded as not relevant

Evidence Table
2 SRs
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 19

SRs Selected by group = 16

Additional searching for RCTs
Initial return = 503
Sifted results = 7

RCTs Selected by group = 2

Evidence Table
1 SR, subsequently rejected, =0

1 SR excluded as a general review not a SR, 14 not relevant

2 RCT rejected as not relevant
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 22

SRs Selected by group = 19

Additional searching for RCTs
Initial return = 711
Sifted results = 12

13 SRs excluded:
1 poor methodology
7 not relevant
2 not SRs
3 superseded by more up-to-date SRs

RCTs Selected by group = 5

4 RCTs excluded:
3 included in SRs
1 not an RCT

Evidence Table
6 SRs, 1 RCT
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 2

SRs Selected by group = 2 0 rejected

Additional searching for RCTs
Initial return = 1283
Sifted results = 6

RCTs Selected by group = 0

Evidence Table
2 SRs
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 21

SRs Selected by group = 21

17 rejected as poor quality and/or superseded by others

Additional searching for RCTs
Initial return = 1995
Sifted results = 11

RCTs Selected by group = 1

1 rejected as poor quality

Evidence Table
4 SRs
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 30

SRs Selected by group = 27

16 SRs excluded:
5 not a SR
11 not relevant

Additional searching for all study types
Initial return = 895
Sifted results = 30

Cohort studies selected by group = 20

15 rejected as not relevant or poor quality

Evidence Table
11 SRs
5 CCTs
Systematic reviews from sifted results = 26

SRs Selected by group = 25

21 rejected as not relevant or poor quality

Additional searching for all study types

Initial return = 895
Sifted results = 30

Cohort studies selected by group = 20

20 rejected as poor quality or not relevant

Evidence Table

4 SRs
Systematic reviews
- Initial recall = 125
- Sifted = 7

SRs Selected by group = 2

No SRs excluded

Additional searching for RCTs
- Initial return = 164
- Sifted results = 15

RCTs Selected by group = 7

All 7 RCTs excluded – either not relevant or poor methodology.

Evidence Table
- 2SRs