

Date: 17th of March 2008

Author: Campbell Collaboration Users Group co-chairs and secretariat

Version: 1.1 (dates updates after Steering Group meeting, March 2008)

Target group: Potential members of the C2UG and therefore producers of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts

Status: The C2UG-secretariat's operational version of the C2SG and C2UG approved *Policy guiding the production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts* (17 March 2008)

Guidelines for writing a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract

This paper is an operational guide for writing an official Campbell Collaboration User Abstract. This first generation guide is based on experiences drawn from the developmental work made over the last couple of years by Nordic Campbell Centre.

*The content of this guide is subject to the requirements for a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract described in the Campbell Collaboration Steering Group approved **Policy guiding the production of Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts** (17 March 2008).*

The Campbell Collaboration Users Group will continuously update this guide.

Introduction

A Campbell Collaboration User Abstract is an official Campbell product. It is based on a Campbell Review, approved by the lead reviewer, and aimed at presenting the findings of the review for non-researchers in order to facilitate evidence-based decisions in everyday judicial, social, welfare or educational practice.

There are two appendixes to this paper: Appendix 1 is an example of a Campbell User Abstract prepared according to the standard in this paper. Appendix 2 is an example of a Campbell User Abstract contextualized by Nordic Campbell Centre. On the Campbell Collaboration homepage are other examples of non-contextualised Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts. Beware though, that the development of the standard described in this paper has been an iterative process, therefore older abstracts may not fully comply with this standard. As the standard develops further it will only be applied to user abstracts from that day forward.

Requirements

There are only two substantive but indispensable requirements when producing Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts:

- 1) All content in the User Abstract must have direct support in the review in question
- 2) The User Abstract must be approved by the lead reviewer¹

In addition to this, the following acknowledgements should always appear on the first page of the abstract:

¹ The lead reviewer may decide to delegate responsibility. In that case, the organisation hosting the production of the abstract should keep a record of this decision.

- Clearly stated reference to the relevant review (authors, title, Campbell Collaboration, year)
- The Campbell Collaboration Logo

Finally, if the review is co-registered with the Cochrane Collaboration it should also include a reference to Cochrane. Throughout the User Abstract the review should be referred to as a “*Campbell/Cochrane Review*” and the line “*The review is also published in Cochrane Library*” should follow the C2-RIPE reference to the review at the first page of the abstract.

The organisation writing the abstract is more than welcome to acknowledge its own work and logo on the first page of the abstract – see examples in appendix 2 where Nordic Campbell Centre is the author of the abstract.

Two versions – two steps

On the one hand, Campbell Reviews gather the best research from all over the world. On the other hand, local context makes research results relevant for everyday use, and local problems, circumstances and issues may vary from country to country. Therefore, Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts potentially come in two versions: A non-contextualized and a contextualized version.

Following these two versions, the dissemination process is divided into two steps: 1) production of the abstract in English, and 2) contextualisation and dissemination. And while step one is a core Campbell activity, step two is part of the optional (but strongly encouraged) outreach activities available to members and affiliates of the Campbell Collaboration Users Group and other entities interested in utilizing the knowledge in Campbell reviews.

Once a non-contextualized Campbell Collaboration User Abstract is produced it will be uploaded to the Campbell website and sent to members and affiliates of the Campbell Collaboration Users Group. Members, affiliates, and others are then encouraged to translate the abstract, incorporate it in their respective organisational layout, add local comments and facts, and disseminate this – now contextualized – abstract to their local networks.

Step one – producing a non-contextualized abstract

The Campbell Collaboration Users Group Governance & Membership Policy Paper (17 March 2008) outlines how to become a member. When an organisation has become a member, the membership is renewed by doing at least one Campbell Collaboration User Abstract per year. This is done in collaboration with the Campbell Collaboration Users Group secretariat which is presently hosted by the Nordic Campbell Centre. The secretariat will coordinate the allocation of newly approved Campbell reviews among Campbell Collaboration Users Group members by matching the review topic with the field of the organisation.

Once a review is allocated to an organisation along with a Word template the writing of the abstract can begin. The following process is based on experiences from Nordic Campbell Centre’s pilot study:

- 1) As a service to the reviewer, the organisation contacts the lead reviewer approx. one month before the organisation expects to be in need of approval of an abstract. At this early date, the organisation a) asks for the lead reviewers’ approval that the

organisation will prepare a user abstract², and b) explains the work flow. The lead reviewer is then given an approximate date when the abstract will be forthcoming.

2) The organisation drafts an abstract in English. The abstract should:

- focus on the main findings in the review
- be written in a non-academic everyday language
- present the problem, the intervention and the results
- make a brief description of facts about the review
- not include local contextual information
- not exceed 6,000 characters (blank spaces included)

Inspiration can be sought in the existing portfolio of abstracts (preferably the most recent abstracts). It is recommended – based on the extensive experience at the Nordic Campbell Centre – that the draft together with the review is circulated for comment and quality control several times within the organisation.

3) The draft is then sent to the lead reviewer for comments and approval. Nordic Campbell Centre has had 13 out of 14 lead reviewers reply positively with few manageable comments within days. This is of course partly dependent on the quality of the work having been done by the member organisation on the abstract.

4) When final approval has been obtained from the lead reviewer, the finished Campbell Collaboration User Abstract is then submitted both to the lead reviewer, the Campbell Collaboration Users Group secretariat and to the Campbell Collaboration web manager to be uploaded on the Campbell Collaboration website along side the approved review, protocol, and title.

An example of a non-contextualized Campbell Collaboration can be seen in *appendix 1* or on the Campbell Collaboration website. Beware though, that older abstracts may not fully comply with this standard.

Step two – suggestions for contextualizing

This step is purely optional and available to any organisation or person.

Once the non-contextualized abstract is written, all members and affiliates of the Campbell Collaboration User Group are encouraged to make further use of the abstract. The Campbell Collaboration recognizes that local organisations have easier access to local users. Therefore, dissemination of user abstracts can benefit tremendously by e.g. being in the local language, related to local context, and dispatched by an organisation known to the local user.

This can be done using the procedure described below.

Layout

When disseminating a Campbell Collaboration User Abstract in a contextualized form proper acknowledgement is encouraged. An example of how this could be done can be seen in *appendix 2*.

² So far – as of February 2008 – no reviewers have withheld approval or collaboration in connection with the 14 Campbell Collaboration User Abstracts produced by the Nordic Campbell Centre. But please note that reviewers are not in any way obliged to collaborate. In case of a negative response from the reviewer, a user abstract following these guidelines cannot be produced.

Contextualization

In order to root the international research results in a local context members and affiliates can e.g. add comments from a local practitioner and local facts to the non-contextualized abstract.

Nordic Campbell Centre has developed the following procedure for this (see also *appendix 2*):

- A relevant practitioner³ or service user is identified and invited to comment on the results of the review. It is well advised to do some kind of an “interview” with relatively standardized questions for the practitioner to answer. But he or she should also be told that “the floor is yours”, i.e. they should feel free to speak their mind based on their reading of the review.
- The practitioner’s comments are placed in a box clearly separated from the Campbell Collaboration User Abstract. It should be clearly stated that this is the personal opinion of the practitioner in question.
- Another box can be added with appropriate local facts and statistics.

The contextualised user abstract can then be shipped out, for example, in an electronic newsletter or used by Knowledge Brokers in some other way.

³ Preferably, he or she could be recruited from the same management level that controls the decisions following from the review. Depending on the review in question this could be anything from a front line practitioner to a top level civil servant.