
The methodological and reporting characteristics of economic methods and outcomes in Campbell reviews: a systematic review

Denny John, Pauline Sobiesuo, Devarshi Bhattacharyya, Luke Vale

Submitted to the Coordinating Group of:

Crime and Justice

Education

Disability

International Development

Nutrition

Food Security

Social Welfare

Methods

Knowledge Translation and Implementation

Business and Management

Other:

Plans to co-register:

No

Yes Cochrane Other

Maybe

Date submitted:

Date revision submitted:

Approval date:

Publication date: 5 April 2019

Title of the review

The methodological and reporting characteristics of economic methods and outcomes in Campbell reviews: a systematic review

Background

The value of economic evaluation to decisions in medical procedures and interventions has been recognized for some years, with economic evaluation now an established tool used by policy-makers and researchers alike. However, the recognition of the importance of economic evaluation as part of the evaluation of social programmes is not so prevalent. Evidence-based effectiveness reviews infrequently report data on the costs and financial effects of preventive interventions and likewise infrequently report evidence on how cost and financial effects relate to other effects by reporting information of cost-effectiveness or other measures of efficiency. Given the problem faced by policy-makers and other end –users of reviews that they have insufficient resources to do all the things that they want this mean that reviews are insufficient to inform judgements about the allocation of resources.

There could be several reasons for this deficiency. There could be an absence of economic evaluation studies that are available for inclusion. There could also be a lack of interest amongst reviewers to add an extra component into an, already, complicated review. Another reason could be the lack of clear guidance about how such data should be identified or reviewed. These and potentially other such reasons may explain why reviews have tended to lack an economic component.

Despite the limitations there are some groups that have attempted to include an economic element. For example, a Campbell review published by Furlong (2012), assessed the effectiveness and cost-effectiveness of behavioural and cognitive behavioural group-based parenting programmes for improving child conduct problems, parental mental health, and parenting skills. The study concluded that the intervention demonstrated evidence of cost-effectiveness, and reported modest programme delivery costs when compared with the long-term health, social, educational, and legal costs associated with childhood conduct problems. The concern is that despite such efforts the application of an economic perspective into a review is haphazard and potentially inconsistent across those reviews that have attempted to do this.

By reviewing how economic evidence has been incorporated into Campbell reviews would provide a benchmark to describe the current usage, and identify areas of best practice that could be more widely emulated and areas for improvements in the methodology.

Policy relevance

The Campbell Collaboration is committed to producing and maintaining high quality systematic reviews in social sciences. The MECCIR (Methodological expectations for Campbell Collaboration Intervention Reviews) were adopted in Campbell reviews to improve standards of conduct and reporting Campbell reviews. In order to identify priorities for editorial processes and improvement, there is a need to assess the current reporting characteristics economic evidence and outcomes in Campbell reviews.

Objectives

The review has three major objectives:

- a) Identify Campbell reviews reporting/analysing economic evidence and outcomes
- b) Assessing the reporting characteristics, e.g. economic commentary, bibliography of economic studies, or full economic evaluation assessment, in Campbell reviews
- c) Assess the methodological quality of how economic evidence and outcomes has been handled in Campbell reviews

Additionally, the review will consider the following two subgroup analyses to compare reviews in terms of their methodology and reporting characteristics:

1. Compare methodological quality and reporting characteristics of economic evidence and outcomes across different coordinating groups
2. Compare methodological quality and the reporting characteristics of Campbell reviews co-registered with Cochrane with those not co-registered in terms of economic evidence and outcomes
3. Check if equity considerations have been accounted in identified economic evaluation studies

Existing reviews

There are no existing reviews comprehensively investigating the methodology and reporting characteristics of economic evidence and outcomes in Campbell reviews.

However, the lead author (DJ) had presented some preliminary characteristics of economic evidence and outcomes in Campbell reviews in the Global Evidence Summit in 2017.

Type of study

This is a review of published Campbell reviews to explore the methodology and reporting characteristics of economic evidence and outcomes.

Type of method

Only studies which specify costs, and/or benefits and/or cost-effectiveness and/or cost-utility of systematic reviews published in Campbell Library will be included in this review. A brief summary of excluded studies and the reasons why the study was excluded from the review will be presented in tabular format. The participants of any type of social programme, irrespective of the study design, will be included in the review. The costs of social programs that may include time of persons involved in the intervention, costs of managing programs, personal and social costs, and indirect/intangible costs for examples costs of suffering incurred by victims in sentencing options, would be included. Associated cost-benefits and/or cost-effectiveness may include monetary savings due to benefits as well as savings to the public systems such as public health and social welfare programs and savings due to the implementation of such interventions, as well as any other additional benefits.

Outcomes

The interest of this review is in studies that assess the economic costs and benefits and/or cost-effectiveness of social programs.

Study designs

Interventional systematic reviews about effects with a full review published in the Campbell Library. We will include Campbell systematic reviews with a full review published between January 2000 to January 2018. Currently, there are 158 full reviews published up to January 2019.

References

<https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/about-campbell/vision-mission-and-principle.html>
https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/images/pdf/MECCIR_conduct_standards_May_2017.pdf
<https://www.globalevidencesummit.org/meetings/evidence-synthesis-costs-and-economic-components-systematic-reviews-health-and-social>

Review authors

Lead review author:

Name:	Denny John
Title:	Evidence Synthesis Specialist
Affiliation:	Campbell Collaboration; Campbell and Cochrane Economic Methods Group
Address:	2 nd Floor, West Wing, ISID Complex
City, State, Province or County:	New Delhi, Delhi
Post code:	110070
Country:	India
Phone:	+91-9987021553
Email:	djohn1976@gmail.com

Co-authors:

Name:	Pauline Sobiesuo
Title:	Health Economist
Affiliation:	Health Economics Group, Newcastle University
Address:	Institute of Health and Society
City, State, Province or County:	Newcastle upon Tyne, Tyne and Wear
Post code:	NE2 4AX
Country:	United Kingdom
Phone:	+44 (0)191 208 7045
Email:	Pauline.Sobiesuo@newcastle.ac.uk

Name:	Devarshi Bhattacharyya
Title:	Assistant Director (Health Economics)
Affiliation:	Kalam Institute of Health Technology
Address:	AMTZ Campus, Pragati Maidan
City, State, Province or County:	Visakhapatnam, Andhra Pradesh
Post code:	530031
Country:	India

Phone:	+91-7896603170
Email:	devarshi.bhattacharyya@gmail.com
<hr/>	
Name:	Luke Vale
Title:	Professor of Health Economics
Affiliation:	Health Economics Group, Newcastle University; Campbell and Cochrane Economic Methods Group
Address:	Institute of Health & Society, Baddiley-Clark Building, Richardson Road
City, State, Province or County:	Newcastle upon Tyne
Post code:	NE2 4AX
Country:	UK
Phone:	+44(0) 191 208 5590
Email:	luke.vale@ncl.ac.uk

Roles and responsibilities

- Content: Denny John, Luke Vale
- Systematic review methods: Denny John, Luke Vale, Pauline Sobiesuo
- Statistical analysis: Denny John, Luke Vale, Pauline Sobiesuo, Devarshi Bhattacharyya
- Information retrieval: Denny John, Pauline Sobiesuo, Devarshi Bhattacharyya

Funding

None

Potential conflicts of interest

Denny John is Evidence Synthesis Specialist, Campbell Collaboration, at its New Delhi office. Luke Vale is the Chair, Campbell and Cochrane Economic Methods Group. Denny John is Co-Convenor, Campbell and Cochrane Economic Methods Group. Pauline Sobiesuo is a member of the Campbell and Cochrane Economic Methods Group.

Preliminary timeframe

- Date you plan to submit a draft protocol: March 2019
- Date you plan to submit a draft review: June 2019