how to write a systematic review dissertation

how to write a systematic review dissertation is a significant undertaking, demanding meticulous planning, rigorous execution, and a comprehensive understanding of scientific inquiry. This advanced form of literature review synthesizes existing research on a specific topic using explicit, transparent, and reproducible methods, aiming to answer a focused research question. It represents a substantial contribution to academic literature, providing a high level of evidence for researchers, policymakers, and practitioners. This article will meticulously guide you through the intricate process, from initial conceptualization and protocol development to the nuanced stages of literature searching, screening, data extraction, synthesis, and final dissertation writing. We will explore the essential methodological considerations, discuss best practices for ensuring rigor and transparency, and provide actionable advice to navigate the challenges inherent in producing a high-quality systematic review dissertation. Our goal is to equip you with the knowledge and tools necessary to successfully complete this rigorous academic endeavor.

- Ensuring Rigor and Addressing Limitations

Understanding the Systematic Review Dissertation

A systematic review dissertation stands apart from a traditional literature review due to its stringent methodology and transparent approach. Unlike narrative reviews, which can be subjective and selective, a systematic review employs explicit, predefined methods to identify, evaluate, and synthesize all relevant research evidence on a particular topic. This methodical process minimizes bias and provides a more reliable and reproducible summary of existing knowledge, making it a powerful tool for informing practice, policy, and future research.

Choosing to write a systematic review for your dissertation demonstrates a sophisticated understanding of research synthesis and a commitment to evidence-based practice. It allows you to address a critical gap in the literature or to consolidate findings from disparate studies, offering a robust answer to a well-defined research question. This type of dissertation is particularly valuable in fields where a wealth of primary research exists but has not been systematically aggregated.

What is a Systematic Review?

At its core, a systematic review is a scientific investigation in itself, where individual studies are treated as the "participants." It involves a structured approach to locating, appraising, and synthesizing research evidence. The process typically begins with a clearly defined research question, followed by the development of a detailed protocol outlining the search strategy, selection criteria, data extraction methods, and planned approach to data synthesis. The adherence to this protocol is crucial for maintaining transparency and reproducibility.

Why Choose a Systematic Review for Your Dissertation?

There are several compelling reasons to embark on a systematic review dissertation. Firstly, it offers a

rigorous training ground in critical appraisal skills, enhancing your ability to evaluate research quality. Secondly, it contributes significantly to the existing body of knowledge by providing a high-level summary of evidence, often identifying gaps or inconsistencies that warrant further investigation. Thirdly, systematic reviews are highly regarded in academic and professional circles for their scientific robustness and utility in informing decision-making. Lastly, it allows you to complete a comprehensive piece of research without necessarily conducting primary data collection, which can be resource-intensive and time-consuming.

Phase 1: Planning and Protocol Development

The foundation of a successful systematic review dissertation lies in meticulous planning and the development of a robust protocol. This initial phase is arguably the most critical, as it dictates the entire subsequent process. A well-constructed protocol serves as a blueprint, guiding your decisions and ensuring consistency, transparency, and reproducibility throughout the review.

Formulating the Research Question

Your systematic review must be driven by a clear, focused, and answerable research question. This question will guide your entire search strategy and define the scope of your review. A common framework for structuring research questions in quantitative reviews is PICO: Population, Intervention, Comparison, Outcome. For qualitative or mixed-methods reviews, alternatives like PEO (Population, Exposure, Outcome) or SPIDER (Sample, Phenomenon of Interest, Design, Evaluation, Research type) may be more appropriate. Ensuring your question is specific and well-defined prevents scope creep and facilitates a manageable review.

Developing a Comprehensive Protocol

The systematic review protocol is a detailed document outlining every step of your planned review. It should be developed before you commence your literature search and ideally registered with an

international database like PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews). Registration enhances transparency and helps prevent duplication of efforts. The protocol should explicitly state:

- The background and rationale for the review.
- The specific research question(s) to be addressed.
- Inclusion and exclusion criteria for studies.
- Detailed search strategy, including databases, keywords, and search filters.
- Methods for study selection (screening process).
- Procedures for data extraction.
- Methods for assessing risk of bias/quality appraisal.
- Planned approach to data synthesis (e.g., meta-analysis, narrative synthesis).
- Methods for addressing potential heterogeneity.

Adhering to a detailed protocol is paramount for the integrity of your systematic review dissertation.

Phase 2: Comprehensive Literature Search

Once your protocol is finalized, the next critical step is to execute a comprehensive and systematic literature search. The goal is to identify all relevant published and unpublished studies that meet your predefined inclusion criteria, minimizing publication bias and ensuring a thorough representation of the available evidence. This phase requires meticulous attention to detail and a strategic approach to

database selection and search term construction.

Identifying Relevant Databases and Sources

A truly comprehensive search extends beyond a single database. You should identify multiple electronic databases relevant to your field of study. Common choices include PubMed, Scopus, Web of Science, Embase, CINAHL, PsycINFO, and Cochrane Library. Beyond these, consider subject-specific databases, grey literature sources (e.g., conference proceedings, dissertations, government reports), and clinical trial registries (e.g., ClinicalTrials.gov) to capture unpublished or ongoing research. Hand-searching reference lists of included articles and key journals can also yield additional relevant studies.

Developing a Robust Search Strategy

Your search strategy must be carefully constructed using a combination of keywords, controlled vocabulary (e.g., MeSH terms in PubMed), and Boolean operators (AND, OR, NOT). Develop a list of synonyms and related terms for each concept in your research question (PICO/PEO elements). Test your search strings rigorously in each database, adjusting them as needed to balance sensitivity (identifying most relevant studies) and specificity (minimizing irrelevant results). Document the exact search string used for each database, including the date of the search, as this forms a crucial part of your dissertation's methodology section, demonstrating reproducibility.

Phase 3: Screening and Study Selection

After executing your comprehensive literature search, you will likely be faced with a large volume of potentially relevant studies. The screening and study selection phase involves systematically reviewing these results against your predefined inclusion and exclusion criteria to identify the studies that will be included in your systematic review dissertation. This process is typically conducted in multiple stages to enhance accuracy and reduce bias.

Initial Title and Abstract Screening

The first stage involves a rapid review of titles and abstracts. Each identified record should be assessed to determine its potential relevance. It is highly recommended that at least two independent reviewers conduct this stage of screening. This dual-review process helps to minimize reviewer bias and reduce errors in judgment. Any disagreement between reviewers should be resolved through discussion or by arbitration with a third reviewer. Tools like Covidence or Rayyan can facilitate this process, making it more efficient and trackable.

Full-Text Article Retrieval and Review

Studies deemed potentially relevant after title and abstract screening proceed to the full-text review stage. The full text of each article is retrieved and independently assessed by two reviewers against the detailed inclusion and exclusion criteria outlined in your protocol. This stage requires careful reading and critical evaluation to ensure each study genuinely meets all specified criteria. Reasons for exclusion at this stage should be meticulously documented for each article, as this information is often presented in a PRISMA flow diagram within your dissertation.

Phase 4: Data Extraction and Quality Assessment

Once the final set of studies for inclusion has been identified, the next critical steps are data extraction and quality assessment. This phase involves systematically collecting relevant information from each included study and critically appraising its methodological rigor and risk of bias. These steps are fundamental for ensuring the validity of your systematic review's findings.

Systematic Data Extraction

Data extraction involves systematically pulling specific information from each included study according to a pre-designed data extraction form or template. This form should be pilot-tested on a few studies and refined before full-scale use to ensure all necessary data points are captured consistently. Key

information to extract typically includes:

- Study characteristics (authors, year, country, study design, objectives).
- Participant characteristics (population, sample size, demographics).
- Intervention/exposure details.
- Outcome measures and results (e.g., effect sizes, p-values, qualitative findings).
- Relevant contextual information.

Again, it is highly recommended that data extraction be performed by two independent reviewers to minimize errors and ensure accuracy, with discrepancies resolved through discussion or a third party.

Assessing Risk of Bias and Study Quality

The quality or risk of bias in included studies significantly impacts the trustworthiness of your systematic review's findings. Various validated tools are available depending on the study design. For randomized controlled trials, the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool is commonly used. For observational studies, tools like ROBINS-I (Risk Of Bias In Non-randomized Studies - of Interventions) or the Newcastle-Ottawa Scale are appropriate. Qualitative studies might use tools like CASP (Critical Appraisal Skills Programme) checklists or specific frameworks. This assessment helps you understand the strengths and limitations of the evidence base and should be conducted independently by two reviewers. The results of this appraisal will inform your data synthesis and discussion of limitations.

Phase 5: Data Synthesis and Analysis

With data extracted and quality assessed, the systematic review dissertation progresses to the crucial

stage of data synthesis and analysis. This phase involves drawing together the findings from the individual studies to answer your overarching research question. The approach to synthesis will depend on the nature of the included studies and your research question, ranging from statistical meta-analysis to qualitative thematic synthesis.

Quantitative Data Synthesis: Meta-Analysis

If your included studies are sufficiently homogeneous in terms of population, intervention, comparison, and outcome measures, and report quantitative data, a meta-analysis may be appropriate. Meta-analysis is a statistical technique that combines the results of multiple studies to produce a single pooled estimate of effect. This provides a more precise and powerful estimate than any individual study. Before conducting a meta-analysis, assess for clinical and methodological heterogeneity. Statistical heterogeneity (variability in effect sizes beyond what is expected by chance) should also be assessed, typically using the I^2 statistic. If significant heterogeneity exists, explore potential sources or consider alternative synthesis methods.

Qualitative and Narrative Synthesis Approaches

When studies are too diverse for meta-analysis (e.g., different designs, outcomes, or qualitative data), or if your research question lends itself to exploring patterns and themes, qualitative or narrative synthesis methods are employed. Narrative synthesis involves a descriptive summary of findings, identifying common themes, patterns, and contradictions across studies. Techniques might include thematic analysis, framework synthesis, or critical interpretive synthesis. The goal is to provide a coherent account of the findings, explaining relationships between studies and contributing to a deeper understanding of the topic, even without statistical pooling.

Phase 6: Reporting and Writing the Dissertation

The final phase of writing a systematic review dissertation involves meticulously reporting your

methods and findings in a clear, concise, and comprehensive manner. The dissertation structure will generally follow standard academic conventions, but with specific sections tailored to the systematic review methodology. Adherence to reporting guidelines like PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) is crucial for ensuring transparency and completeness.

Structuring Your Dissertation Chapters

Your systematic review dissertation will typically include the following chapters:

- **Introduction:** Provides background, rationale for the review, and states the research question(s) and objectives.
- **Literature Review:** Sets the broader context, discusses the existing knowledge base, and highlights the gap your review addresses.
- **Methodology:** This is a highly detailed chapter outlining every step of your systematic review process, mirroring your protocol. It includes search strategies, inclusion/exclusion criteria, screening process, data extraction methods, quality appraisal tools, and synthesis approach.
- **Results:** Presents the findings of your review. This includes a description of the included studies, detailed data from the extraction tables, risk of bias assessments, and the results of your synthesis (e.g., meta-analysis forest plots, thematic maps, narrative summaries). A PRISMA flow diagram is essential here.
- **Discussion:** Interprets your findings in relation to your research question and existing literature. Discuss the implications of your results, acknowledge the limitations of your review (and the included studies), and suggest directions for future research.
- **Conclusion:** Summarizes the main findings and their significance.
- **References:** Comprehensive list of all cited works.

- **Appendices:** Includes full search strategies, data extraction forms, detailed risk of bias assessments, and any other supplementary material.

Adhering to Reporting Guidelines

The PRISMA statement is the internationally recognized guideline for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses. It provides a 27-item checklist and a four-phase flow diagram to ensure that all essential information is included in your report. Using PRISMA as a framework for writing your methodology and results sections will significantly enhance the clarity, transparency, and reproducibility of your dissertation. For qualitative evidence syntheses, consider guidelines like ENTREQ or eMERGe. Adherence to these guidelines demonstrates your commitment to best practices in systematic review methodology.

Ensuring Rigor and Addressing Limitations

A high-quality systematic review dissertation is characterized by its methodological rigor and an honest acknowledgment of its limitations. Maintaining transparency and addressing potential biases throughout the process are paramount to the credibility and impact of your work.

Strategies for Maintaining Rigor

Rigor in a systematic review is achieved through several key strategies. Firstly, a well-developed and registered protocol ensures that your methods are predefined and transparent. Secondly, the involvement of at least two independent reviewers in the screening, data extraction, and quality appraisal stages significantly reduces the risk of individual bias and error. Thirdly, detailed documentation of every decision, from search string modifications to exclusion reasons, allows for full reproducibility of your work. Lastly, the systematic application of validated risk of bias tools and adherence to reporting guidelines like PRISMA ensures that your review is conducted and presented

according to established scientific standards.

Acknowledging Limitations

No systematic review is without limitations, and a robust dissertation will openly discuss these. Limitations can arise from various sources:

1. **Limitations of the included studies:** These might include methodological flaws in primary studies (identified during quality appraisal), small sample sizes, or a lack of studies on specific populations or interventions.

2. **Limitations of the review process:** Despite best efforts, some limitations might arise from your own review, such as the scope of your search (e.g., language restrictions, database choices), potential publication bias, or subjective decisions made during data synthesis.

3. **Heterogeneity:** If there was significant clinical or methodological diversity among studies, this might limit the generalizability or precision of your findings.

Clearly articulating these limitations demonstrates critical thinking and provides context for interpreting your results. It also opens avenues for future research, suggesting how subsequent studies or reviews might address these gaps.

Successfully completing a systematic review dissertation is a testament to your analytical skills, perseverance, and commitment to contributing valuable evidence to your field. By following a structured, transparent, and rigorous approach, you can produce a high-impact piece of academic work that significantly advances understanding in your chosen area.

Q: What is the primary difference between a literature review and a systematic review dissertation?

A: The primary difference lies in methodology and transparency. A traditional literature review can be broad, selective, and often subjective, summarizing existing literature based on the author's discretion. In contrast, a systematic review dissertation employs explicit, predefined, and reproducible methods to identify, evaluate, and synthesize all relevant research evidence on a specific, focused question. It aims to minimize bias and provide a comprehensive, objective summary of the current state of knowledge, often adhering to strict reporting guidelines like PRISMA.

Q: Do I need to register my systematic review protocol, and where?

A: While not always mandatory, registering your systematic review protocol is highly recommended and considered best practice. It enhances transparency, helps prevent duplication of efforts by other researchers, and demonstrates your commitment to a rigorous methodology. The most widely recognized platform for registering systematic review protocols is PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews). Other registers might exist for specific fields or types of reviews (e.g., Campbell Collaboration for social interventions).

Q: How long does it typically take to complete a systematic review dissertation?

A: The timeline for a systematic review dissertation can vary significantly depending on the scope of the research question, the volume of literature, the complexity of the data synthesis, and the availability of resources (e.g., access to databases, support for dual review). On average, a systematic review itself can take anywhere from 6 to 18 months. When integrated into a dissertation, which includes comprehensive writing, defense preparations, and institutional procedures, the entire process could extend to 1.5 to 3 years, similar to other forms of doctoral research.

Q: What are common challenges faced when writing a systematic review dissertation?

A: Common challenges include: managing the vast amount of literature identified in searches; maintaining consistency and agreement during dual screening and data extraction; dealing with significant heterogeneity among studies that prevents meta-analysis; accessing full-text articles; and critically appraising studies with diverse methodologies and varying quality. Additionally, time management, staying organized, and adhering strictly to the protocol can be demanding.

Q: Which reporting guidelines should I follow for my systematic review dissertation?

A: The most widely recognized and recommended reporting guideline for systematic reviews and meta-analyses is the PRISMA (Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses) statement. It includes a checklist of essential items to report and a flow diagram for illustrating the study selection process. If your review involves qualitative evidence synthesis, you might also consider guidelines such as ENTREQ (Enhancing Transparency in Reporting the Synthesis of Qualitative Research) or eMERGe (moving towards best practice for reporting literature reviews).

Q: Is it possible to conduct a systematic review on qualitative studies?

A: Yes, it is absolutely possible and increasingly common to conduct systematic reviews of qualitative studies. This is known as qualitative evidence synthesis or qualitative systematic review. Instead of statistical meta-analysis, these reviews use methods like thematic synthesis, meta-ethnography, or grounded theory to identify, analyze, and synthesize themes, concepts, and interpretations from qualitative data. The aim is to generate new theoretical insights or a more comprehensive understanding of a phenomenon from the perspectives of participants.

Q: How do I ensure accuracy during data extraction?

A: To ensure accuracy during data extraction, it is crucial to use a standardized, pre-piloted data extraction form. Ideally, two independent reviewers should extract data from each included study. Any discrepancies between the reviewers should be resolved through discussion, consensus, or arbitration by a third, senior reviewer. Thorough documentation of the extraction process and any decisions made is also vital for transparency and reproducibility.

How To Write A Systematic Review Dissertation

How To Write A Systematic Review Dissertation

Back to Home: http://www.speargroupllc.com