

Literature Searching Service 2017-2018: a review

Analysis of activity

During the 2017-2018 period a total of **571 (up from 424)** literature searches were received and **554** were completed by members of the Informatics team. **16** searches were cancelled, **3** by the users, **1** was converted into a training session and **12 (2%)** searches had incomplete data. A total of **3413.75** hours were spent completing searches.

The term “literature search” is used in its broadest sense to cover R&D work.

Division/ Business Units

The largest number of requests came from Medicine & Cancer – Specialist Medicine, followed by Integrated Care – Rehab & Older People.

Count of Division - Business Unit

Division - Business Unit	Total
Diagnostics, Surgery & Anaesthesia - Anaesthetics	15
Diagnostics, Surgery & Anaesthesia - Pathology	5
Diagnostics, Surgery & Anaesthesia - Radiology	3
Diagnostics, Surgery & Anaesthesia - Surgery	39
Diagnostics, Surgery & Anaesthesia - T&O	41
Integrated Care - Maternity, Gynae & GUM	24
Integrated Care – Paediatrics	40
Integrated Care - Pharmacy & Therapies	11
Integrated Care – Rehab & Older People	74
Medicine & Cancer - Acute Med	44
Medicine & Cancer – Cancer	36
Medicine & Cancer - Specialist Med	148
Trustwide - Business Dev, Transformation & Operational Performance	32
Trustwide - Med Directors Office	22
Trustwide - Nursing & Quality	27
Trustwide – Trust Secretariat	1
Trustwide - Workforce Management	8
Grand Total	571

Departments

The department which requested the most searches was the Elderly Medicine department, followed by the Renal Unit. Interestingly, we have completed a literature search for the Chief Executive this year.

Count of Department

Department	Total	Department	Total
Anaesthetics	7	Library & Knowledge	2
Bariatrics	1	Lower GI	1
Breast Surgery	1	MAU	2
Cancer Centre	3	Maxillofacial & Orthodontics	4
Chief Executive	1	NICU	12
Clinical Change Management Group	3	Obs&Gynae	23
Clinical Measurement	4	Occupational Therapy	1
Clinical Procurement	2	Oncology	6
Clinical Psychology	15	Paediatrics	15
Communities of Practice	1	Pain Services	2
Community Dietetics	2	Parkinson's Group	3
Corporate Nursing	14	Pathology	5
Dermatology	34	Patient Safety	7
Diabetes\Endocrine	25	Physiotherapy	4
Dietetics	5	R&D	14
Education & Workforce	5	Radiology	3
Elderly Medicine	64	Rehabilitation Medicine	1
Emergency Dept	43	Renal Unit	53
ENT	6	Respiratory	20
External	1	Rheumatology	4
Falls Group	8	Specialist Medicine	2
Gastroenterology	6	Specialist Palliative Care	27
General Surgery	9	Stroke Unit	1
Hand Centre	31	Surgical Education Unit (SET)	2
Human Resources	3	Transformation	30
Integrated Care and Discharge	1	Trauma & Orthopaedics	11
ITU/Stepdown	6	Urology	14
Learning & Ed PDU	1		
		Grand Total	571

User Groups

The main user group of the search service was Consultants, followed equally by Nursing & Midwifery staff and Junior Doctors.

Count of Staff Group	
Staff Group	Total
Academic	1
Allied Health Professional	81
Clinical Psychologist	13
Consultant	169
Doctor	116
External	1
Nursing & Midwifery	116
Staff - Admin\Management	74
Grand Total	571

Reasons for use

The most frequent reason for a literature search was related to general patient care, followed by service development.




Count of Reason Why	
Reason Why	Total
Audit	15
Care of Specific Patient	63
General Patient Care	162
Guideline Development	36
Other	6
Professional Development	11
Research	67
Service Development	142
Teaching Purposes	19
Writing a Paper	35
Grand Total	556

Survey responses

The online survey received **42** (59%) completed responses as well as **29** (41%) partially completed responses (total n=71). Users were alerted to respond to the survey via a link posted with the results and via numerous regular email drops carried out throughout the year. Individual members of the Informatics team members were also requested to contact the users of the service and add a link to their email signatures. Unlike previous years, the response rate was quite low. This needs to be addressed for next year's report, to enable us to understand how to improve our service.



The first two questions pertained to the users name, directorate, and search topic.

Question 3

3. How relevant were the results to your search request? (Please select one)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Completely		80.95%	34
2	Mostly		16.67%	7
3	Partly		2.38%	1
4	Not at all		0.00%	0
			answered	42
			skipped	0

The largest number of respondents (80.95%) found that the results were completely relevant to the search request

Question 4

4. Have you read the summary sheet provided? (Please select one)					
				Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes			92.86%	39
2	No			0.00%	0
3	Not Applicable			7.14%	3
				answered	42
				skipped	0

The majority of respondents (92.86%) read the summary sheet provided. All respondents who received a summary read it.

Question 5

5. If yes, was it:					
		Yes	No		Response Total
Accurate?		100.0% (39)	0.0% (0)		39
Useful?		100.0% (33)	0.0% (0)		33
				answered	39
				skipped	3

100% found the summary to be accurate and 100% of respondents found it useful. However, 6 respondents skipped the question on usefulness. In most cases, it is unclear why. Therefore, this question may need re-formatting for future surveys.

Question 6

6. Have you obtained any full-text articles from the references?				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Yes	<div><div></div></div>	69.05%	29
2	No	<div><div></div></div>	30.95%	13
			answered	42
			skipped	0

The majority (69.05%) obtained full-text articles from the references supplied.

Question 7

7. If yes, was it:			
	Yes	No	Response Total
Via the links?	96.8% (30)	3.2% (1)	31
Via Inter-Library Loan?	4.3% (1)	95.7% (22)	23
		answered	31
		skipped	11

The majority of respondents (96.8%) accessed the full-text via the links (a slight increase). Only 4.3% used the Inter-Library Loan service for full text articles. This is a drop in usage of Inter-Library Loans of nearly 30% compared to the previous year. This may be due to users needing to become familiar with the new Clio requesting system. Future survey results may clarify if this is the case.

Question 8

8. What was the immediate impact of the information provided on your knowledge? (Please select yes, no or N/A - not applicable - for each statement):				
	Yes	No	N/A	Response Total
It refreshed my memory of details or facts	75.0% (30)	0.0% (0)	25.0% (10)	40
Some of it was new to me	95.0% (38)	2.5% (1)	2.5% (1)	40
It substantiated what I knew or suspected	92.5% (37)	2.5% (1)	5.0% (2)	40
I could use at least some information immediately	89.7% (35)	5.1% (2)	5.1% (2)	39
I will need to obtain more information on the topic	45.9% (17)	51.4% (19)	2.7% (1)	37
I expected to find something else	12.8% (5)	79.5% (31)	7.7% (3)	39
I will share this information with colleagues	97.5% (39)	2.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	40
I will add this to my own information collection	97.5% (39)	2.5% (1)	0.0% (0)	40
			answered	42
			skipped	0




The highest immediate impact of the search results provided was that users would add this information to their own information collection and share it with a colleague.

Question 9

9. Did the information impact on any of the following areas? (Please select yes, no or N/A - not applicable - for each statement)				
	Yes	No	N/A	Response Total
Patient information	35.9% (14)	38.5% (15)	25.6% (10)	39
Direct patient care	65.0% (26)	20.0% (8)	15.0% (6)	40
Revision of treatment plan	34.2% (13)	42.1% (16)	23.7% (9)	38
Development of guideline	54.8% (23)	26.2% (11)	19.0% (8)	42
Care plan written / revision	18.9% (7)	48.6% (18)	32.4% (12)	37
Contributed to audit	32.4% (12)	48.6% (18)	18.9% (7)	37
Legal or ethical issues	5.3% (2)	63.2% (24)	31.6% (12)	38
Professional development	85.0% (34)	10.0% (4)	5.0% (2)	40
			answered	42
			skipped	0



The searches are used by respondents to support a number of impacts. 85% reported that the results received would impact on their professional development, followed by 65% who said the impact would be on direct patient care. Interestingly, searches to support development of guidelines increased by 13.2%, whereas searches for legal or ethical issues reduced by almost 20% compared to last year.

Question 10

10. How did you hear about the Literature Search Service? (please select one)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Library Staff		73.81%	31
2	Promotional Material		0.00%	0
3	Colleague		19.05%	8
4	Intranet		0.00%	0
5	Other		7.14%	3
			answered	42
			skipped	0

Over 73% heard about the literature searching service from the library staff and 19% from a colleague. Other promotional methods appear to be less successful. However, as the team is already working at full capacity, this is not a cause for concern at present.

Question 11

11. How would you rate this service? (Please select one)				
			Response Percent	Response Total
1	Excellent		92.86%	39
2	Good		7.14%	3
3	Satisfactory		0.00%	0
4	Poor		0.00%	0
			answered	42
			skipped	0

Over 92% rated the literature search service as “Excellent”.

Question 12

There were 25 free text comments giving further feedback on the service. Generally users thanked the library staff and commented that the service was “*excellent*” and “*brilliant*”. Some respondents commented on the supportive nature of the service received. Other respondents referred to the expert skills utilised and the timeliness and thoroughness of the search results. However, it was noted that delays in completion can be problematic. Delays are likely due to staff capacity, pressure of workload and the complexity of the search question(s). The comments also highlight a need for improved access to full text articles.

“Whilst I had completed a literature search on the topic, I was really interested to find that your search pulled from a wider range of literature and it has really helped to broaden my thinking on the topic. Thank you”.

“I was very grateful for this review, especially as it was able to be completed quickly. It helped inform a document I was doing for a parliamentary review of mental health support for people with Parkinson”.

“Some links are hard to access etc., Having the full text article file attached along with the summary would be very easy to access and helpful”.

“A brilliant service. I don't have the time or the expertise to gather the most reliable and up-to-date information sometimes and it's brilliant to have someone who is an expert in this area to help us”.

“Very supportive team in the clinical library service who also supported with the use and discussion of the research and literature with the team at LRCH to support a development plan around improving enhanced care and cohorting for our patients”.

“one to one literature search service was really helpful and useful in refining my search strategy especially if the search involves a systematic review where a robust search is important”.

“Very helpful- very detailed search results which were useful for my own knowledge. I would use the service again however I think if it was for a project etc I would try and contact further in advance as there was a delay on receiving the information. However the library services representative was very helpful and felt like a part of the team on the ward”.

“The two searches prepared were brilliant, clearly laid out and identified a number of potential areas for improvement”.

Conclusions

- There were more searches received and completed than in the previous year (35% increase in requests).
- The main user groups have remained primarily the same: Consultants followed by Nursing & Midwifery. However, this year junior doctors have also used the service heavily.
- The two main reasons for search requests remained the same, but in a direct reversal of last year's figures general patient care overtook service development as the most frequent reason.
- The survey response rate was lower this year than in previous years. It is unclear why.
- Over 96% of respondents who completed the survey found the results either completely or mostly relevant to their search request.
- Over 92% of respondents rated the literature search service as "excellent". This is a slight, but insignificant drop from previous years.
- 100% of those who responded to both questions found the summary to be accurate and useful. However, 6 respondents skipped the question on usefulness.
- The majority of respondents (96.8%) accessed the full-text via the links. However, one user commented on difficulties of access.
- Only 4.3% of respondents used the Inter-Library Loan service for full text articles. This may reflect the introduction of the new Clio request system.
- Professional development (85%) remained the main area that information would impact on, followed by direct patient care (65%).
- The majority of users (over 73%) hear about the service via the library staff.

The literature search service is highly valued by our users and contributes to a range of outcomes supporting successful delivery of the Trust objectives.