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Background
- Each randomised trial (represented by 🍏) relevant to your group could, potentially, be the focus of a review (represented by 🍎).
- How you define the scope of your reviews allows an educated guess to be made about the likely total number of reviews possible from your register.

Aims
- To ‘guesstimate’ the ratio of reviews:study relevant to the care of people with schizophrenia
- To construct an algorithm to assist the process of anticipating reviews

Methods
- Using trial coding of intervention per study we automatically generated comparisons for each study within Excel and Access – and duplicate-checked this
- We mapped a hierarchical list relevant to one drug along one branch of the topic tree

Materials
- Fully coded register of trials
- Person on work experience from school
- Basic MS Excel and Access skills

Results
- 11,000 studies generated 14,000 ‘intervention X vs. intervention Y’ statements
- When crudely duplicate-checked this results in 7000 comparisons
- We selected one relatively new drug for piloting (ziprasidone – 466 relevant automatically generated statements)
- These 466 were inspected and concatenated into branches containing potential topics for meaningful reviews
- One new drug – widely trialed – generated 28 titles for reviews – review:study ratio of 1:17

One example: Ziprasidone
- Below is the potential branch of the topic tree for ziprasidone
- Predictable titles (some illustrated) are accompanied by less predictable smaller topics
- Repetition could estimate the stability of the 1:17 ratio across different interventions

Conclusions
- This project would have been impossible without high-grade indexing of the register
- With a semi automated program this process would be made much shorter, easier and more efficient.
- Within CRS it is feasible that reliable coding could lead to automatic generation of titles and population of those titles with study links
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