Editorial Process for Updating Cochrane Diagnostic Test Accuracy (DTA) Systematic Reviews

- 1. Decision to update a Cochrane DTA review (authors / CRG)
- 2. Notify DTA Editorial Board / CRG highlighting changes to the original review methods (see table below)
- 3. Updated DTA review submitted to CRG by review authors
- 4. CRG send updated review for clinical review and in parallel for DTA Editorial review
- 5. Once received by the DTA Editorial Team the updated review will be assigned, where possible, to the Contact Editor assigned to the original review. Alternatively the updated review will be assigned to another DTA contact Editor.
- 6. The assigned Contact Editor will assess the review update considering:
 - a. currency and appropriateness of the updated review methods
 - b. changes in methods employed in the updated review compared to the original review
 - c. changes in scope of the updated review compared to the original review
 - d. changes in findings of the updated review compared to the original review
- 7. Where the methods, scope or findings of the updated review have changed from the original review (including instances where changes are required as a result of methodological advances) the Contact Editor will request external peer review and /or discussion at an Editorial Board meeting before approving the updated review for publication.
- 8. Where methods, scope and findings are unchanged the Contact Editor may make an acceptance decision outside of an Editorial Board meeting or may schedule the updated review for discussion at an Editorial Board meeting.
- 9. The expected turnaround time for completing Editorial Review of an updated DTA review will be the same as for original review submissions (8 weeks) if the update needs peer review but will be substantially quicker if the update only needs to be seen by the Contact Editor.

PROTOCOL SECTIONS TO BE CONSIDERED WHEN PLANNING AN UPDATE OF A DTA REVIEW

| Protocol section | Protocol sections requiring update | Update schedule plan |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| Background | Assess whether the current | EG |
| and research | review question remains | Update information on the burden of target disorder |
| question | relevant | Update information on relevant testing policy |
| | | Add / remove index tests or test combinations |
| Inclusion criteria | Consider whether the existing | EG |
| | PIRT remain current, in the light | • Take into account revised definitions of the target disorder (including subgroups) that |
| | of new knowledge. | may influence the performance of index tests |
| | | Add / remove index tests or test combinations |
| | | Take into account new comparator tests or comparator test combinations |
| Methods | Appraise and update the | EG |
| | methods considering | Searching |
| | methodological advancements or | Update according to advances in search strategy methods |
| | developments and revision to the | Revise search strategy accommodating changes in PICO |
| | search question. | <u>Data Extraction</u> |
| | | Consider whether additional data items need extracting |
| | | Consider whether original data extraction items are redundant |
| | | Quality assessment |
| | | • Use of QUADAS-2 |
| | | Consider the need for Quality assessment of comparative test accuracy studies. |
| | | (QUADAS C) |
| | | • <u>Synthesis</u> |
| | | Update methods according to revisions to the research question and studies |
| | | identified(e.g. index test variation; comparators; study designs) |
| | | Update according to advances in synthesis methods |
| Results / | Ensure Summary of findings | |
| Conclusions | table is provided | |
| Plain language | ◆Plain Language Summary (PLS) | Revisions to PLS should be made with reference to PLS guidance. |
| summary | guidance for DTA reviews is now available | https://www.jclinepi.com/article/S0895-4356(18)30420-7/pdf |