How Academic Libraries Support Systematic Reviews and Evidence Syntheses

A Comparison between R1 and R2 Institutions

Alyssa C. Borozan, Bonnie L. Fong, and Siobhan K. McCarthy

As more faculty and graduate students conduct systematic reviews and other evidence/knowledge syntheses, it can be helpful for academic libraries to provide services and resources to support this type of research. This study identifies trends in evidence/knowledge synthesis support services among (thirty-six) selected institutions with Carnegie classifications of R1 or R2. Data about services and resources was collected from research guides, webpages, and via communications with library employees. There are many similarities between how R1 and R2 institutions are providing support, with a higher incidence of more comprehensive services among R1 universities. Most R1 institutions in our sample provide a systematic review service consisting of both consultation and co-authorship levels of support, supplemented by synchronous workshops and asynchronous materials (e.g., research guides). Systematic review services among R2 institutions are less prevalent, although those with medical or health sciences libraries were more likely to provide similar support as R1 institutions. Interestingly, the number of librarians supporting systematic reviews research is generally comparable across the two types of institutions, except at the upper end of the range, which is dominated by R1 institutions. Observed trends are expected to be useful for informing strategic planning, librarian training, and systematic review service development for libraries across R1 and R2 Carnegie classifications.

Introduction

In recent years, there has been increased interest from faculty and graduate students at many colleges and universities in conducting systematic reviews and related evidence/knowledge synthesis in a variety of disciplines. Lê, Neilson and Winkler define systematic reviews and other types of knowledge synthesis as "a research methodology that attempt[s] to find all available evidence on a topic to help answer specific questions."[1] For the purposes of this study, we will use the term "systematic reviews" in the broadest sense to describe the different types of evidence/knowledge synthesis, including scoping reviews, meta-analyses, and more. As enthusiasm builds, libraries are creating formal services to support this type of research, expanding from the health sciences (where they are more common) into the physical sciences, social sciences, humanities, and more.[2]

Systematic review service models in health sciences libraries and other academic libraries show considerable variation. This may depend on institutional factors and resources available. As faculty

Alyssa C. Borozan is Sprague Library Graduate Assistant, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ; **Bonnie L. Fong** (email: fongb@montclair.edu) is Head for Research and Reference Services, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ; **Siobhan K. McCarth**y is Scholarly Communications Librarian, Montclair State University, Montclair, NJ.

and students request more assistance from librarians to conduct systematic reviews, this has the potential to affect staffing, services, and other resources. University and library administrators must consider the extent to which librarians will be involved with faculty research versus student research, what training and mentoring is required, what the time commitment would be, how it would affect librarian workloads, whether fees should be charged, and how this work would count towards tenure and promotion applications.[3] While researching existing models, Lackey, Greenberg, and Rethlefsen came across libraries with differing levels of commitment by librarians, including where one or more librarians' main responsibility was to contribute to systematic reviews; where teams of librarians spend small portions of their time supporting systematic reviews; and where liaison librarians support this type of research within their usual duties rather than as a separate service.[4] At some universities, libraries manage demand by providing distinct levels of service to different groups, such as offering only guidance or consultations to students, and more in-depth support to faculty researchers.[5] When there was an increase in the number of requests from faculty and students for assistance with systematic review search methodology at the University of Minnesota, Riegelman and Kocher realized that only some librarians had been trained on this level of research synthesis, whereas others felt insufficiently prepared, which led to recommendations to formalize their library's systematic review service and train library staff specifically to support systematic reviews.[6]

Librarians might assume a wide range of roles when supporting systematic reviews. As research and publication related to systematic reviews rise, libraries continue to define their role and develop service models that take into consideration their capacity for supporting these time-intensive activities.[7] This might include assistance with question formulation, protocol development, citation management, technological and analytical tools, documentation and reporting, collaboration, and/or planning.[8] Spencer and Eldredge identified eighteen roles for librarians, from the more traditional expert searcher and teacher, to the less common ones of planner and documenter.[9] Typically, the more involved a librarian is, the more credit they receive for their contributions, sometimes resulting in their being listed as a co-author for published work.

This study explores the systematic review support services provided by institutions with Carnegie Classifications of R1 and R2. The Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education is determined by The American Council on Education and categorizes institutions by levels of research activity. An R1 institution is defined as a doctoral-granting university with very high research activity, and an R2 institution is defined as a doctoral-granting university with high research activity.[10] The authors sought to compare what services specific R1 and R2 institutions provide, and to identify any apparent service trends between the two. Our research questions were:

1. What types of services and resources have been commonly adopted by R1 versus R2 universities to support systematic review services?
2. Are there differences in how academic libraries at R1 versus R2 institutions support systematic reviews?
3. How many librarians are available to support systematic review services in R1 versus R2 institutions?

The hope was that this research would inform us as we consider how to support systematic reviews research at our R2 institution. We expect other academic libraries will also find our study helpful as they create or improve upon their own systematic review services.

Methods

To determine the types of services and related resources libraries at R1 and R2 institutions provide to support systematic reviews research, we looked at the websites and research guides of a selection of college and university libraries in the United States. While this approach is similar to the environmental scan performed by Kallaher et al.,[11] our research differs in that we identified support services with the intent to further identify the types and formats of specific synchronous support (e.g., consultations, co-authorship, workshops) and asynchronous learning objects. Our research began in the fall of 2022 when we were tasked by our library administration to explore the feasibility of offering a systematic review service to our faculty and possibly students. As such, the focus was to review our university's NJ IPEDS (Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System) Peers[12] and aspirant peers, as well as selected additional institutions in the United States with established systematic review services (see Table 1). The additional institutions were identified via a Google

Table 1. Institutions Studied

NJ IPEDS Peers	Aspirant Peers	Additional Institutions
The College of New Jersey [M1]	Florida International University [R1]	Cornell University [R1]
Kean University [D/PU]	George Mason University [R1]	Dartmouth College [R1]
Montclair State University [R2]	Georgia State University [R1]	George Washington University [R1]
New Jersey City University [M1]	Indiana University Indianapolis [R1]	Harvard University [R1]
New Jersey Institute of Technology [R1]	Miami University (OH) [R2]	Pennsylvania State University [R1]
Ramapo College of New Jersey [M1]	Northern Arizona University [R2]	Princeton University [R1]
Rowan University [R2]	San Diego University [R2]	Temple University [R1]
Rutgers University-Camden [R2]	University at Buffalo-SUNY [R1]	University of Alabama at Birmingham [R1]
Rutgers University-Newark [R2]	University of Central Florida [R1]	University of California San Diego [R1]
Rutgers University-New Brunswick [R1]	University of Massachusetts Boston [R2]	University of Chicago [R1]
Stockton University [D/PU]	University of North Carolina Greensboro [R2]	University of Kansas [R1]
William Paterson University [M1]		University of Maryland [R1]
		University of Minnesota [R1]
		University of Pennsylvania [R1]
		University of Virginia [R1]
		Washington University School of Medicine [R1]
		Bowling Green State University [R2]
		East Carolina University [R2]
		East Tennessee State University [R2]

search for "systematic review service" AND "site:.edu". Since our research questions focused on R1 and R2 institutions, those that did not have these Carnegie Classifications were excluded from our study, resulting in a sample size of thirty-six.

We collected information about services and resources pertaining to systematic reviews in two ways. First, we thoroughly examined the libraries' website and research guides to find relevant workshops, videos, tutorials, or modules, and to determine if they offered a systematic review service. When information about the number of librarians committed to supporting systematic reviews was not readily available online, we reached out to library representatives via email or utilized their chat service to gain more insight into this. All data sources are listed in Appendix A.

Results

To address our research questions, we compared how libraries at twenty-four R1 institutions and twelve R2 institutions in the United States support systematic reviews research in the form of services and resources. Data collected from research guides, webpages, and communications with library employees is summarized in Tables 2 and 3. All but three of the thirty-six institutions

Table 2. Systematic Review Services and Resources at R1 Institutions

University Name	Librarians Supporting Systematic Reviews	Consultation	Co-authorship	Workshops	Research Guide	Systematic Review Webpage	Videos	Tutorials/ Modules	Medical/Health Science Library
Cornell University	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Dartmouth College	2-3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes
Florida International University	4	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
George Mason University	2	Yes			Yes		Yes		
Georgia State University	3-8	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes	
George Washington University	5	Yes	Yes		Yes				Yes
Harvard University	8-10	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
Indiana University Indianapolis	20-22	Yes	Yes		Yes			Yes	Yes
New Jersey Institute of Technology	0								
Pennsylvania State University	4-7	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes
Princeton University	3	Yes	Yes		Yes				
Rutgers University-New Brunswick	4	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Temple University	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
University of Alabama at Birmingham	4-8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes
University at Buffalo-SUNY	8	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
University of California San Diego	4	Yes			Yes	Yes			Yes
University of Central Florida	2	Yes			Yes		Yes		Yes
University of Chicago	2	Yes	Yes		Yes				Yes
University of Kansas	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
University of Maryland	7	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes	Yes
University of Minnesota	12	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes			Yes
University of Pennsylvania	14	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes
University of Virginia	5	Yes	Yes		Yes				Yes
Washington University School of Medicine	6	Yes	Yes		Yes	Yes			Yes

Table 3. Systematic Review Services and Resources at R2 Institutions

University Name	Librarians Supporting Systematic Reviews	Consultation	Co-authorship	Workshops	Research Guide	Systematic Review Webpage	Videos	Tutorials/ Modules	Medical/Health Science Library
Bowling Green State University	2	Yes			Yes		Yes		
East Carolina University	6	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes				Yes
East Tennessee State University	5	Yes	Yes			Yes			Yes
Miami University	5	Yes			Yes				
Montclair State University	1	Yes		Yes	Yes				
Northern Arizona University[a]	4-9	Yes		Yes	Yes		Yes		
Rowan University	3	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		Yes		Yes
Rutgers University-Camden	0								
Rutgers University-Newark	0								
San Diego State University	3	Yes		Yes	Yes				
University of Massachusetts Boston	5	Yes							
University of North Carolina Greensboro	2-7	Yes			Yes				

[a] *A pilot systematic review service was launched in 2018 and there is mention of librarians helping to find appropriate literature for systematic reviews, so we interpreted this to mean they offer consultations.*

provided either a synchronous service or asynchronous support manifested as a research guide or webpage focused on systematic reviews.

Consultation vs. Co-authorship

The distinction between consultations and co-authorship levels of service were generally similar across universities. Considered the first level of service, consultations often consist of providing information and other resources about the systematic review process; helping with research question formulation appropriate for the different types of evidence syntheses; recommending search strategies and how to document them; recommending where to search (e.g., specific databases); recommending protocol registration platforms appropriate for their discipline (or where to search for existing protocols on their project idea); and/or providing training on citation management tools. The co-authorship level of service is sometimes referred to as collaboration in the literature and involves a much greater investment of time from the librarian. It goes beyond the initial consultation to include providing input on the protocol; identifying databases and grey literature resources to search; constructing a robust search strategy; translating the search strategy across databases and other search platforms; conducting searches and exporting them to citation management software, then performing deduplication; gathering full-text and setting up article screening software; and writing up the part of the methods section related to searching. Given this level of contribution to the project, the expectation is that the librarian would be listed as a co-author. For consultations, some libraries explicitly state that librarians should be included in the "Acknowledgements" section of a paper.

In our sample, a much larger percentage of R1 institutions (75% of 23) provide both consultation and co-authorship services compared to R2 institutions (25% of 13) (see Tables 2 and 3). An additional 21% of R1 institutions and 58% of R2 institutions offer consultations only, with some as part of established systematic review services. We found that institutions with a medical or health science library usually provide consultation and/or co-authorship services. This was the case for 100% of the 20 relevant R1 institutions and the 3 relevant R2 institutions. Princeton University Library (R1) was the only one to offer both levels of systematic review services even though it does not have a medical or health sciences library.

Workshops

At both R1 and R2 institutions, offering workshops about systematic reviews is not as ubiquitous as providing consultations or co-authorship services. Libraries are more likely to offer workshops if they have a systematic review service or have a medical or health science library (see Tables 2 and 3). Approximately 54% of the R1 institutions and 42% of R2 institutions in our sample offer workshops related to systematic reviews, with 62% and 80% of those, respectively, being introductory or overview-type workshops (see Appendix B). At R1 institutions, the remaining more advanced or in-depth workshops cover topics such as the overall systematic research process, how to conduct the different types of reviews (e.g., scoping, systematic), protocols, developing a comprehensive search, systematic review tools, or how to conduct reviews in specific fields of study (e.g., social sciences, health sciences). At the sole R2 institution offering a more advanced skill workshop, the focus was on using Covidence for systematic review management.

Resources

Generally, when libraries had both a webpage and research guide about systematic reviews, the webpage focused on services and the guide focused on resources. Libraries typically describe the type of support librarians provide for systematic reviews and who they offer these services to on their webpage. On their research guide, they post videos, tutorials, or modules. Appendix A includes

the URLs for the systematic review service webpages and research guides for all the institutions in our study.

More R1 institutions (96%) than R2 institutions (75%) in our sample had either a research guide or webpage with information about the systematic review process or service (see Tables 2 and 3). Due to the nature of how many of the R1 institutions came to be included in our study, this is unsurprising. Approximately 25% of the R1 and R2 institutions posted videos on the topic of systematic reviews, with a mix of content created by their own library, as well as by others. Many of the videos for R1 institutions went more in-depth into the steps involved in completing a systematic review (e.g., how to formulate a research question for a systematic review), whereas videos for R2 institutions focused more on describing systematic reviews in general and explaining the search process involved. One-quarter of R1 institutions posted tutorials or modules on their sites. In general, these tutorials and modules covered the systematic review process or provided an overview of the different types of evidence/knowledge syntheses.

Librarians

While some libraries clearly identify the number of librarians and/or name the specific individuals who participate in systematic review services, this information can be more ambiguous at other institutions, especially as additional librarians undergo training to provide this type of support. We found the number of librarians participating in these services ranged from 0-22 for R1 institutions, with a median of 4.5, and a mean of 5.7 (see Table 2). At R2 institutions, this number ranged from 0-9, with a median of 3.8, and a mean of 3.4 (see Table 3). Notably, the number of librarians supporting systematic review research is comparable across the two types of institutions, with the exception being that R1 institutions dominate the higher end of the range.

At some institutions, health science librarians may assist researchers from other disciplines with systematic review projects even if they are not in their liaison areas, whereas at others, science and social science librarians provide support in addition to medical and health science librarians. With institutions that do not have medical or health science libraries, the number of librarians supporting systematic review services were similar across R1 and R2 classifications (i.e., 0-8 librarians supporting systematic review research at R1 institutions, and 0-9 supporting them at R2 institutions). This is likely due to more liaison librarians being trained to consult on systematic reviews research, with the occasional library having trained all librarians to do so.

Discussion

This study looks at how librarians at R1 and R2 institutions are supporting systematic reviews research. As interest in this type of research grows among faculty and graduate students, it follows that there will be more demand for libraries and librarians to support it. There are many similarities between how R1 and R2 institutions provide support, with a higher incidence of more comprehensive services among R1 universities. The difference likely comes from availability of resources and possibly demand for services. Almost all libraries at R1 institutions offering both consultation and co-authorship services are more likely to provide workshops as well as supplemental resources such as videos, modules, and tutorials. R1 institutions with very high research activity might also be more likely to have access to the databases, citation management tools, and systematic reviews software, as well as graduate students who serve on the research team—all of which would make it easier for researchers to complete a systematic review. R1

institutions may also have more librarians on staff, and possibly more librarians per FTE students who have been trained to conduct systematic reviews. These details could be topics of future study.

Although many R1 institutions may be more well-resourced to run a full systematic review service, some of the R2 institutions studied were able to provide a similar level of service. This may depend on institutional factors such as university needs, available funding, administrative support, librarian capacity, and librarian and researcher training. For example, those with medical or health science libraries may have more dedicated resources to support systematic reviews. When R1 or R2 institutions are not able to provide co-authorship levels of service, they may only offer consultations or teach workshops. Those unable to dedicate enough librarians to support synchronous systematic review services might create asynchronous research guides, webpages, or other online modules that introduce researchers to the systematic review process, with the option to provide guidance to researchers to conduct their reviews independently. Many libraries at R2 institutions recommend the same resources as R1 institutions, providing links to helpful external resources such as the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*,[13] Campbell Library: The Production of a Systematic Review,[14] the Cornell University Systematic Review Decision Tree,[15] PRISMA protocols,[16] and articles such as Grant & Booth's, "A typology of reviews: An analysis of 14 review types and associated methodologies."[17]

As mentioned previously, while systematic reviews have historically been common in the health sciences, this type of research has seen recent growth in other subject areas. All R1 and R2 institutions in our study with a medical or health science library support systematic review research. However, the libraries at Cornell University, University of Minnesota, and University of Arizona designed additional services for the non-health sciences.[18] Although only three of the R2 institutions we looked at have medical or health science libraries, ten of these institutions support systematic reviews. This may be the result of more liaison librarians being trained at R2 institutions to consult on systematic reviews research. Considering the steep learning curve for systematic reviews research, it may be possible for the more experienced health sciences librarians to mentor and help train liaison librarians in other disciplines, although standards do vary depending on the field. Perhaps a librarian new to systematic reviews could initially serve as an apprentice on one or more reviews to learn from more experienced librarians and researchers.[19] This would lead to a greater number of librarians trained to provide support for this type of research in the future.

While the information from this study can be useful, we recognize its limitations. Our method for identifying institutions to study was initially limited to peer institutions in our home state and our aspirant peers. Google searches to identify additional institutions that offer systematic review services yielded more R1 than R2 institutions. Although this could mean that there are simply more R1 institutions that offer such services, it is possible that these institutions are ranked higher by Google's search algorithm than R2 institutions, so they show up higher on the results list. Given the nature of how we identified the additional institutions, it is highly probable that our sample of libraries are more likely to support systematic reviews than are representative of R1 and R2 institutions in general. Still, we believe our findings provide good insight into how those R1 and R2 institutions that are currently supporting this type of research are doing so. Further study is needed to determine if our sample of R1 and R2 institutions is an accurate reflection.

As previously acknowledged, the number of librarians who participate in their library's systematic review services is sometimes ambiguous. At some institutions, there is no clear distinction between whether librarians support systematic reviews through a specified service or through individual librarian support. For example, many libraries state that faculty and students can request

a consultation, but do not clarify if this consultation is part of an established systematic review service with a librarian who has been trained in that process or is simply a meeting with a liaison librarian who may be knowledgeable about systematic reviews, but not formally trained in it. The number of librarians supporting systematic reviews might increase as librarians complete their training for providing systematic review services, or it may decrease as librarians leave their positions. It could also change as library and university priorities change, or as demand for these services evolve. Some libraries state that once they reach capacity, they may not be able to provide systematic review support to all researchers.

Individual institutions may find it helpful to perform a needs assessment to determine what type of support their researchers in the different disciplines require and what levels of support their libraries are able to provide. Slebodnik, Pardon, and Hermer found some similarities in standards between the health sciences and non-health sciences, but they were not universally or consistently adhered to.[20] If libraries want to start slowly, they could begin with a research guide linking out to some of the more popular existing training materials such as videos or tutorials. We found the Cornell University, University of Minnesota, and University of Maryland guides particularly helpful and prevalent among the research guides and web pages reviewed in this study. In addition, the Evidence Synthesis Institute coordinated by librarians from the University of Minnesota, Cornell University, and Carnegie Mellon University, can be extremely beneficial for those outside of the health sciences; those unable to attend the Institute can access materials from the program online.[21] Libraries might offer an introductory-level workshop such as one about the differences between the various types of evidence/knowledge syntheses. Perhaps librarians can provide consultations if they are unable to support co-authorship levels of service. If limited staffing is a concern, they might consider beginning with a service for specific groups, such as those with grant funding. Charging fees may also be a solution to help manage growth. Of course, when groups are excluded from a service, it is important to consider how libraries can still serve them equitably.[22]

Future research about how universities and libraries prioritize the types of researchers they serve and types of systematic reviews services they support could be enlightening. This might include examining who is served (e.g., faculty, graduate students, undergraduate students, administrators), which disciplines have access to these services, and which librarians are trained and/or explicitly have evidence synthesis responsibilities. Further investigation might also explore how libraries determine whether to offer consultation or co-authorship levels of service, teach workshops, provide software support (e.g., Covidence, Rayyan), or acquire databases or other resources necessary for performing systematic reviews. How do libraries prioritize when faced with high demand? Is it based on a first-come, first-served model? Are grant recipients prioritized? Or is there a more nuanced approach? These insights would contribute to a deeper understanding of how academic libraries are responding to the growing demand for systematic review support and help them make decisions around resource allocation and appropriate service models.

References

1. Lê, Mê-Linh, Christine J. Neilson, and Janice Winkler. "Benchmarking Librarian Support of Systematic Reviews in the Sciences, Humanities, and Social sciences." *College & Research Libraries* 85, no. 4 (2023): 606-620. https://doi.org/10.5860/crl.85.4.606.

2. Lê, Neilson, and Winkler. "Benchmarking Librarian Support of Systematic Reviews in the Sciences, Humanities, and Social sciences." 606-620; Dalton, Michelle. "How Individual Consultations with a Librarian Can Support Systematic Reviews in the Social Sciences." *Journal of Information Literacy* 13, no. 2 (2019): 163-172. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.11645/13.2.2621; Kallaher, Amelia, et al.. "Library Systematic Review Service Supports Evidence-Based

Practice Outside of Medicine." *Journal of Academic Librarianship* 46, no. 6 (2020): 102222. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acalib.2020.102222; Slebodnik, Maribeth, Ellysa Stern Cahoy, and Anna Liss Jacobsen. "Evidence Synthesis: Coming Soon to a Library near You?" *portal: Libraries and the Academy* 22, no. 2 (2022): 273-80. https://doi.org/10.1353/pla.2022.0016.

3. Gore, Genevieve C. and Julie Jones. "Systematic Reviews and Librarians: a Primer for Managers." Partnership: the Canadian *Journal of Library and Information Practice and Research* 10, no. 1 (2015). https://doi.org/10.21083/partnership.v10i1.3343.
4. Lackey, Mellanye J., Heidi Greenberg, and Melissa L. Rethlefsen. "Building the Systematic Review Core in an Academic Health Sciences Library." *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA* 107, no. 4 (2019): 588-594. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2019.711.
5. Godbey, Samantha, Ruby Nugent, and Aidy Weeks. "A Multidisciplinary Approach to Systematic Reviews" (poster presented at the ACRL Conference, virtual, 2021). https://www.ala.org/sites/default/files/acrl/content/conferences/confsandpreconfs/2021/MultidisciplinaryApproach.pdf.
6. Riegelman, Amy and Megan Kocher. "A Model for Developing and Implementing a Systematic Review Service for Disciplines Outside of the Health Sciences." *Reference & User Services Quarterly* 58, no. 1 (2018): 22-27. https://doi.org/10.5860/rusq.58.1.6837.
7. McKeown, Sandra and Amanda Ross-White. "Building Capacity for Librarian Support and Addressing Collaboration Challenges by Formalizing Library Systematic Review Services." *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA* 107, no. 3 (2019): 411-419. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2019.443.
8. Demetres, Michelle R., et al. "A Decade of Systematic Reviews: An Assessment of Weill Cornell Medicine's Systematic Review Service." *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA* 111, no. 3 (2023): 728-732. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2023.1628.
9. Spencer, Angela J. and Jonathan D. Eldredge. "Roles for Librarians in Systematic Reviews: a Scoping review." *Journal of the Medical Library Association: JMLA* 106, no. 1 (2018): 46-56. https://doi.org/10.5195/jmla.2018.82.
10. Carnegie Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, "Basic Classification." Accessed June 22, 2024. https://carnegieclassifications.acenet.edu/carnegie-classification/classification-methodology/basic-classification/.
11. Kallaher, et al. "Library Systematic Review Service Supports Evidence-Based Practice Outside of Medicine." 102222.
12. IPEDS is a system of survey components that collect data on academic libraries' resources, services, and expenditures. Integrated Postsecondary Education Data System. "Academic Libraries Resources Center." Accessed June 22, 2024. https://nces.ed.gov/ipeds/report-your-data/resource-center-academic-libraries.
13. Cochrane Training. "Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions." Accessed June 22, 2024. https://training.cochrane.org/handbook.
14. Campbell Collaboration. "Publish with Campbell." Accessed June 22, 2024. https://www.campbellcollaboration.org/research-resources/writing-a-campbell-systematic-review.html.
15. Cornell University Library, "Systematic Review Decision Tree." accessed June 16, 2024, https://guides.library.cornell.edu/ld.php?content_id=52561085.
16. Shamseer et al. "PRISMA for Systematic Review Protocols (PRISMA-P)." Accessed June 22, 2024. https://www.prisma-statement.org/protocols.
17. Grant, Maria J. and Andrew Booth. "A Typology of Reviews: an Analysis of 14 Review Types and Associated Methodologies." *Health Information & Libraries Journal* 26, no. 2 (2009): 91-108. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1471-1842.2009.00848.x.
18. Kallaher, et al. "Library Systematic Review Service Supports Evidence-Based Practice Outside of Medicine." 102222; Kline, Elizabeth. "Leveraging Existing Services to Support Evidence Synthesis Researchers Outside of the Health Sciences." *Journal of Graduate Librarianship* 1, no. 1 (2023). https://doi.org/10.59942/2995-9063.1008; Riegelman, Amy and Megan Kocher. "A model for developing and implementing a systematic review service for disciplines outside of the health sciences," 22-27.

19. Riegelman and Kocher. "A model for developing and implementing a systematic review service for disciplines outside of the health sciences," 22-27.

20. Slebodnik, Maribeth, Kevin Pardon, and Janice Hermer. "Who's Publishing Systematic Reviews? An Examination Beyond the Health Sciences." *Issues in Science and Technology Librarianship*, no. 101 (2022). https://doi.org/10.29173/istl2671.

21. Evidence Synthesis Institute. "Evidence Synthesis Institute," Accessed June 16, 2024. https://pressbooks.umn.edu/evidencesynthesisinstitute.

22. Kline. "Leveraging Existing Services to Support Evidence Synthesis Researchers Outside of the Health Sciences."

Appendix A. Data Sources

R1 Institutions

Cornell University

- Research Guide: https://guides.library.cornell.edu/evidence-synthesis/steps
- Systematic Review Page: https://www.library.cornell.edu/services/evidence-synthesis
- Cornell University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2023)

Dartmouth College

- Research Guide: https://researchguides.dartmouth.edu/sys-reviews
- Systematic Review Page: https://www.dartmouth.edu/library/biomed/services/systematic-review-service.html
- Dartmouth College Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2023)

Florida International University

- Research Guide: https://library.fiu.edu/systematicreviews
- Florida International University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

George Mason University

- Research Guide: https://infoguides.gmu.edu/SR
- George Mason University Librarians (personal communications, Spring 2025)

Georgia State University

- Research Guide: https://research.library.gsu.edu/systematicreview
- Georgia State University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

George Washington University

- Research Guide: https://guides.himmelfarb.gwu.edu/systematic-review-service

Harvard University

- Research Guide: https://guides.library.harvard.edu/meta-analysis
- Systematic Review Page: https://countway.harvard.edu/research-instruction-team/review-service
- Harvard University Librarians (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Indiana University Indianapolis

- Research Guide: https://iu.libguides.com/EvidenceSynthesis
- Indiana University Indianapolis Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

New Jersey Institute of Technology

- Research Guide: none available
- New Jersey Institute of Technology University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Pennsylvania State University

- Research Guide: https://guides.libraries.psu.edu/edpsyreviews
- Systematic Review Page: https://hershey.libraries.psu.edu/services/systematic-review
- Pennsylvania State University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Princeton University

- Research Guide: https://libguides.princeton.edu/systematicreview

Rutgers University-New Brunswick

- Research Guide (Health Sciences): https://libguides.rutgers.edu/Systematic_Reviews
- Research Guide (Social Sciences): https://libguides.rutgers.edu/es_social/librarian

Temple University

- Research Guide: https://guides.temple.edu/systematicreviews/systematicreviewservice
- Systematic Review Page: https://library.temple.edu/services/systematic-review-service
- Temple University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

University of Alabama at Birmingham

- Research Guide: https://guides.library.uab.edu/systematicreviews/libraryservices

University at Buffalo-SUNY

- Research Guide: https://research.lib.buffalo.edu/systematicreviews
- Research Guide: https://research.lib.buffalo.edu/evidence-synthesis

University of California, San Diego

- Research Guide: https://ucsd.libguides.com/systematic-review
- Systematic Review Page: https://library.ucsd.edu/research-and-collections/systematic-reviews.html
- University of California of San Diego Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

University of Central Florida

- Research Guide: https://guides.med.ucf.edu/SystematicReviews

University of Chicago

- Research Guide: https://guides.lib.uchicago.edu/systematicreviewservice
- University of Chicago Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2023)

University of Kansas

- Research Guide: https://guides.lib.ku.edu/SR
- Systematic Review Page: https://lib.ku.edu/services/research/systematic-reviews
- Kansas University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2023)

University of Maryland

- Research Guide: https://guides.hshsl.umaryland.edu/EvidenceSynthesis
- University of Maryland Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

University of Minnesota

- Research Guide: https://libguides.umn.edu/c.php?g=1264119&p=9269094
- Systematic Review Page: https://www.lib.umn.edu/services/systematic-reviews

University of Pennsylvania

- Research Guide: https://guides.library.upenn.edu/SR/service

University of Virginia

- Research Guide: https://guides.hsl.virginia.edu/sys-review-resources

Washington University School of Medicine

- Research Guide: https://libguides.wustl.edu/brownschoollibrarysystematicreviews/home
- Systematic Review Page: https://becker.wustl.edu/services/systematic-scoping-review-service/

R2 Institutions

Bowling Green State University

- Research Guide: https://libguides.bgsu.edu/evidencesynthesis
- Bowling Green State University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2023)

East Carolina University

- Research Guide: https://libguides.ecu.edu/systematicreviewservice
- East Carolina University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

East Tennessee State University

- Systematic Review Page: https://www.etsu.edu/medlib/services/systemic-review.php

Miami University

- Research Guide: https://libguides.lib.miamioh.edu/systematicreviews
- Miami University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Montclair State University:

- Research Guide: https://montclair.libguides.com/c.php?g=1024622&p=8419692

Northern Arizona University

- Research Guide: https://libraryguides.nau.edu/pbclibrary/systematicreviews

- Northern Arizona University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Rowan University

- Research Guide: https://rowanmed.libguides.com/systematicreviews
- Systematic Review Service Page: https://rowanmed.libguides.com/SystematicReviewService
- Rowan University Libraries Associate Director (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Rutgers University-Camden

- Research Guide: none available
- Rutgers University-Camden Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

Rutgers University-Newark

- Research Guide: none available
- Rutgers University-Newark Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

San Diego State University

- Research Guide: https://libguides.sdsu.edu/LitReview
- San Diego State University Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

University of Massachusetts Boston

- Research Guide: none available
- University of Massachusetts Boston Librarian (personal communication, Spring 2025)

University of North Carolina Greensboro

- Research Guide: https://uncg.libguides.com/systematicreviews

Appendix B. Workshops

R1 Institutions

Cornell University

- An Introduction to Evidence Synthesis

Dartmouth College

- So You Want to do a Systematic Review? (Intro)
- Protocol 101
- Developing a Comprehensive Search (parts 1, 2, and 3)
- What Happens Next?: Criteria Screening and Risk of Bias

Florida International University

- Systematic Review Workshop (overview)

Georgia State University

- Literature Searching for Systematic Reviews

Harvard University

- Introduction to Systematic Reviews

Rutgers University-New Brunswick

- Institute for Comprehensive Systematic Review
- Systematic, Scoping, and Literature Reviews, Oh My!
- Introduction to Systematic / Scoping Reviews
- An Introduction to Evidence Synthesis in the Social Sciences
- Evidence Synthesis in the Social Sciences
- So You're Writing a Social Science Scoping Review: An Overview of the Process
- So You're Writing a Social Science Systematic Review: An Overview of the Process
- So You're Crafting Your Search Strategy: A Workshop for Systematic and Scoping Review Writers in the Social Sciences
- How to Use a Citation Management Tool to Manage References for Systematic / Scoping Reviews
- How to Use JBI SUMARI to Manage Systematic / Scoping Reviews
- How to Use Rayyan to Screen References for Systematic / Scoping Reviews

Temple University

- Systematic Review Tools and Introduction to Systematic Reviews

University of Alabama Birmingham

- Systematic Review Tools, The Research Process for Systematic Reviews

University at Buffalo-SUNY

- Introduction to Systematic Review Methodology

University of Kansas

- Introduction to Systematic Reviews

University of Maryland

- Systematic Review Overview (for faculty only)

University of Minnesota

- The Evidence Synthesis Institute

University of Pennsylvania

- Introduction to Systematic Reviews and Literature Searching for Systematic Reviews

R2 Institutions

East Carolina University

- Brief educational introductory sessions to systematic reviews

Montclair State University

- Critically Reading Systematic Reviews

Northern Arizona University

- Intro to Covidence for Systematic Review Management

Rowan University

- Conduct Systematic Reviews in the Health Sciences

San Diego State University

- Systematic and Scoping Review Workshop (overview)