1. New teams needed to update CSG reviews

As part of the Cochrane Infrastructure Annual Report for 2013, we recently assessed all of our published reviews. This resulted in some of our authors relinquishing their titles, so we invite you to visit the following webpage to view the CSG updates in need of new teams:
http://skin.cochrane.org/vacant-reviews.

To apply for a title, simply complete our Title Registration Form, but please ensure your team meets the ‘Requirements of the composition of a CSG authoring team’. If you cannot form a full team, please contact the editorial base (csg@nottingham.ac.uk), so we can help you find relevant authors.

If you are an individual without a team, each title on the website has accompanying information stating how much interest it has generated. If you have an interest in co-authoring any title, please let us know, and we can put you in contact with others who are in the same position, with a view to forming a team together.

Please re-visit this webpage periodically, as titles are regularly added and then removed when teams have been formed.

2. Studies should NOT be excluded on the basis of outcomes*

We have had a number of reviews recently where authors have excluded studies that reported outcomes not of interest to their review. Such studies should be included in the review, with an explanation that their prespecified outcomes were not addressed and so there will be no data that could be used in an analysis.

The Skin Group’s policy is to include all studies that match the inclusion criteria of a review irrespective of the how the study’s outcomes match the prespecified outcomes of interest to the review.

Our policy follows guidance from the following MECIR standards:

MECIR conduct standard 40: “Systematic reviews typically should seek to include all relevant participants who have been included in eligible study designs of the relevant interventions and had the [study’s] outcomes of interest measured. Reviews must not exclude studies solely on the basis of reporting of the outcome data, since this may introduce bias due to selective outcome reporting. While such studies cannot be included in meta-analyses, the implications of their omission should be considered. Note that studies may legitimately be excluded because [the study’s] outcomes were not measured. Furthermore, issues may be different for adverse effects outcomes, since the pool of studies may be much larger and it can be difficult to assess whether such outcomes were
MECIR reporting standard 32: “Studies should never be excluded from a review solely because no outcomes of interest are reported.”

*Exception*

The only time it is acceptable to exclude studies because they did not report your review’s outcomes of interest is when you have stated in the protocol that your outcomes are part of the eligibility criteria for the inclusion of trials, as detailed in MECIR conduct standard 8:

“Clarify in advance whether outcomes listed under ‘Criteria for considering studies for this review’ are used as criteria for including studies (rather than as a list of the outcomes of interest within whichever studies are included).”

---

3. Job advert

The Centre of Evidence Based Dermatology, Nottingham, UK, have some exciting new academic career opportunities, which may be of interest to some of our CSG members.

The new academic posts are for Clinical and Non-clinical Assistant Professors (lecturer) and Associate Professors (senior lecturer), and if you would like more information, please visit the following link:

http://www.nottingham.ac.uk/jobs/currentvacancies/ref/MEDACAD2.