

## 2009 International Campbell Collaboration (C2) Colloquium

---

### Submitter Information

Ralf Schlosser  
Email: r.schlosser@neu.edu

### Abstract Information

**Abstract Title:**

Not all reviews are created equal: an overview of appraisal methods

**Format:**

Symposium

**Themes:**

better evidence

**Authors:**

Ralf W. Schlosser, Ph.D., Northeastern University Oliver Wendt, PhD, Purdue University Miriam Boesch, MS., Doctoral student, Purdue University

**Abstract:**

The presenters in this symposium will emphasize that appraisals of reviews can serve a dual role. On the one hand, appraisals of reviews are necessary for engaging in evidence-based practice after a review is completed. On the other hand, appraisal considerations and tools may assist with the design and planning of a systematic review at the protocol development stage. Participants will be introduced to an overview of appraisal considerations based on Schlosser, Wendt, and Sigafoos (2007). In addition, participants will learn of different methods and tools for appraising systematic reviews. This includes the approach used by Evidence-Based Communication Assessment and Intervention, which is a secondary journal that appraises published evidence. Presenters will illustrate several structured appraisal abstracts of systematic reviews carried out by them in their role as commentary authors (e.g., Schlosser & Wendt, 2008; Wendt, Koul, & Hassink, 2008). Additionally, the presenters will demonstrate the application of the EVIDAAC Systematic Review Scale, a recently developed appraisal tool for systematic reviews. This tool is used for appraising systematic reviews indexed in the database Evidence in Augmentative and Alternative Communication (EVIDAAC), the development of which was funded by the U.S. Department of Education, National Institute for Disability and Rehabilitation Research. The application of this tool will be illustrated as an appraisal tool as well as a planning tool for developing a systematic review (e.g., Boesch, in press). Selected References Boesch, M. (in press). Using the EVIDAAC Systematic Review Scale to guide the process of conducting a systematic review. In D. Lage (Ed.), *Theoretical and Methodological Issues in Research on Augmentative and Alternative Communication* [Proceedings of the Tenth Biennial Research Symposium of the International Society for Augmentative and Alternative Communication (ISAAC)]. Toronto, Canada: ISAAC. Schlosser, R. W., Raghavendra, P., Sigafoos, J., Eysenbach, E., Blackstone, S., & Dowden, P. (2008). EVIDAAC Systematic Review Scale. Unpublished manuscript, Northeastern University, Boston. Schlosser, R. W., & Wendt, O. (2008). Facilitated communication is contraindicated as a treatment choice; a meta-analysis is still to be done [Abstract]. *Evidence-Based Communication Assessment and Intervention*, 2, 81 – 83. Abstract of Probst, P. (2005). Communication unbound—or unfound? An integrative review on the effectiveness of facilitated communication (FC) in non-verbal persons with autism and mental retardation. *Zeitschrift für Klinische Psychologie, Psychiatrie und Psychotherapie*, 53, 93–128. Schlosser, R. W., Wendt, O., & Sigafoos, J. (2007). Not all systematic reviews are created equal: Considerations for appraisal. *Evidence-Based Communication Assessment and Intervention*, 1, 138-150. Wendt, O., Koul, R., & Hassink, J. M. (2008). Time post-onset does not affect response to treatment in patients with chronic aphasia =1 year after stroke [Abstract]. *Evidence-Based Communication Assessment and Intervention*, 2, 199 – 202. Abstract of Moss, A., & Nicholas, M. (2006). Language rehabilitation in chronic aphasia and time postonset: A review of single-subject data. *Stroke*, 37, 3043-3051.

---