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Systematic reviews

- Routinisation of processes of review – searching, selection, appraisal, synthesis
- Advantages seen to lie in rigour and transparency of process
- Address the fallibility of informal reviews
Systematic reviews challenge “the author” and emphasise procedure

- Weakness of informal review seen to derive from failures in procedural specification and tendency of reviewer to
  - Be chaotic or negligent in identifying and assessing relevant evidence
  - Construct idiosyncratic theories and marshall evidence in support of these
The standard critique

- SRs fail to recognise the contingencies and fuzzy realities of practice and experience
- SRs tend to answer answerable question rather than useful question
- Counts the things that can be measured, rather than (all) the things that are important
- Too much affinity with controlling agendas of managers and policy-makers
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But this critique is often based on a caricature

And may only apply in certain situations
Conventional systematic review

- Is a very good thing
- But only when used for the right questions
- Many of the criticisms apply only when it is inappropriately used for the wrong questions
- Or when it is valorised as the only legitimate way of doing any review
Sources of frustration with SRs

• Tendency to see systematic reviews as the only authoritative source of “the evidence”
• Proceduralisation of review processes very appropriate and necessary for some types of question – not others
• Scientific credibility seen to derive from displays of compliance with procedures
• Procedures can involve suppression of “the author” (critique, creativity, interpretation)
• Constructs the thing “to be known” in a limiting way
There are different types of review question

• Review questions are of different types and demand different forms of answers
• Review methods need to be matched to the type of questions
• Broadly, review methods are either *interpretive* or *aggregative*, though most contain elements of both
Some types of questions

- Listing
- Estimating
- Establishing relationships (esp of causality)
- Finding factors implicated in relationships
- Identifying causal chains

- Identifying conditions of causality
- Creating taxonomies
- Describing and characterising
- Determining stages
- Theorising and explaining
Systematic reviews typically produce aggregative syntheses

- Focus on summarising data
- Categories under which data are to be summarised are assumed to be secure and well-specified
What can be studied is always a relationship or an infinite regress of relationships. Never a “thing”. (Bateson, 1978)
Interpretive syntheses

• Sees the generation of the concepts of the analysis as one of its tasks - category specification therefore deferred til end of process

• Examples include meta-ethnography
  – but this has thus far been used only for small sets of studies and only for qualitative studies
Why we need critical interpretive synthesis

• Situations where what is required is a theorisation of the evidence
• Encourage critique of literatures, questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions about concepts and methods
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• Situations where what is required is a theorisation of the evidence

• Where critique of literatures, questioning of taken-for-granted assumptions about concepts and methods is needed

Examples

• Why are rates of breastfeeding so low among the socio-economically deprived?

• Is the “inverse care law” true?
Critical Interpretive Synthesis

- Conducts critique rather than critical appraisal – treats literature as an object of inquiry
- Questions “normal science” conventions and what influences choice of proposed solutions
- Embraces all types of evidence (qual, quan, theoretical) and is attentive to procedural defects in primary studies
- Acknowledges relevance of adjacent literatures
- Explicitly oriented towards theory generation
Critical interpretive synthesis

- Start with a review topic; formulate the question more precisely after scoping stage and remain open to possibility of modification
- Document searches, but draw creatively on literatures that don’t fit precise search criteria
- Formal “critical appraisal” may be necessarily for some, but not all, papers
- Critique is a key element of the process
- Synthesis is at the level of concepts
- Sampling and theory generation proceed concurrently
Critique of literature on access to healthcare

• “Inverse care law” is by no means proven
• Tendency to identify certain groups as likely victims of poor access
• Invoke normative assumptions about “need” relative to some apparently privileged group
• Tendency to assume lower use reflects discrimination
• Access is an emergent, not a fixed property
  – Utilisation studies very limited
CIS of access to healthcare

• Focus on how features of “the case” are orchestrated and how resources are mobilised around it
• Aspects of social and technical eligibility
• Influence of “operating conditions”
Outcomes of a CIS

• A review with fuzzy boundaries
• A mid-range theory
• Voice of “the author” is explicit and reflexively accounted for
Conclusions

• Review questions must be analysed to determine what type of answer they demand
• Method for synthesis should be matched to question
• Critical interpretive synthesis aims to put “the author” back in where appropriate
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