

# Burns Care: a Critical Appraisal of Systematic Review Quality over Time

Jared M. Campbell<sup>1</sup>, Sheila Kavanagh<sup>2</sup>, Rochelle Kurmis<sup>3</sup>, Zachary Munn<sup>4</sup>

1 The Joanna Briggs Institute, University of Adelaide, SA, 5005, jared.campbell@adelaide.edu.au

2 Adult Burns Centre, Royal Adelaide Hospital, 5000, Sheila.Kavanagh@health.sa.gov.au

3 Adult Burns Centre, Royal Adelaide Hospital, 5000, Rochelle.Kurmis@health.sa.gov.au

4 The Joanna Briggs Institute, University of Adelaide, SA, 5005, Zachary.Munn@adelaide.edu.au

That healthcare be informed by the best available evidence is important in all areas of practice, but particularly burns care which requires numerous unique and important considerations. Systematic reviews seek to identify and synthesise all studies conducted regarding a certain topic or intervention in order to inform evidenced-based health care, and are considered the highest level of evidence. In order to be worthy of this regard, systematic reviews must be carried out rigorously and correctly or they become susceptible to numerous potential sources of bias. As such, the aim of this study was to investigate the methodological quality of all systematic reviews on burns care topics published in peer reviewed journals to determine their quality and their worth in guiding evidence-based burns care. Databases searched were Pubmed, Embase, Cochrane Library (including the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effectiveness), and the JBI Database of Systematic Reviews and Implementation Reports. The search included all studies published since 2009, which is the year of publication of the PRISMA statement, an evidence-based set of minimum standards that were established to help authors improve the conduct and reporting of systematic reviews. Initial search terms and MeSH headings were; burn, burns, thermal, systematic review, meta-analysis. Any systematic review published in English on any area of burns care were eligible for inclusion. Overall, 407 potentially relevant systematic reviews were identified, of which 96 met the inclusion criteria and were appraised. Critical appraisal was then carried out using the assessment of multiple systematic reviews (AMSTAR) tool by two independent reviewers in order to create an accurate assessment of the quality of systematic reviews conducted on burns care. This presentation will discuss the overall quality of systematic reviews in burns care, and suggest recommendations for authors working in this field.

## Key Words

Systematic review, critical appraisal, evidence-based healthcare

## Nominated Stream for Oral Presentations

- Medical
- Nursing
- Allied Health
- Scientific

## Nominated Stream for Poster Presentations

- Care
- Prevention
- Research