

## **Publication of Cochrane Reviews in print journals and books**

(Information taken from Higgins JPT, Green S, editors. Publication of Cochrane reviews in print journals and books. *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* 4.2.5 [updated May 2005]; Section 2.2.4. <http://www.cochrane.org/resources/handbook/hbook.htm> (accessed 2nd November 2005))

### **2.2.4 Publication of Cochrane reviews in print journals and books**

Authors may wish to seek co-publication of Cochrane reviews in peer-reviewed healthcare journals, particularly in those journals that have expressed enthusiasm for co-publication of Cochrane reviews. For The Cochrane Collaboration, there is one essential condition of co-publication: Cochrane reviews must remain free for dissemination in any and all media, without restriction from any of them. To ensure this, Cochrane authors grant the Collaboration world-wide licences for these activities, and do not sign over exclusive copyright to any journal or other publisher. A journal is free to request a non-exclusive copyright that permits it to publish and re-publish a review, but this cannot restrict the publication of the review by The Cochrane Collaboration in whatever form the Collaboration feels appropriate. To republish material published in the *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* elsewhere, most particularly in print journals, authors must complete a 'permission to publish' form available in the Cochrane Manual, along with an explanation of the procedures to follow.

Authors are strongly discouraged from publishing Cochrane reviews in journals before they are ready for publication in *CDSR*. This applies particularly to Centre directors and editors of CRGs. However, journals will sometimes insist that the publication of the review in *CDSR* should not precede publication in print. When this is the case, authors should submit a review for publication in the journal after agreement from their CRG editor and before publication in *CDSR*. Publication in print should not be subject to lengthy production times, and authors should not unduly delay publication of a Cochrane review either because of delays from a journal or in order to resubmit their review to another journal.

Journals can also request revision of a review for editorial or content reasons. External peer review provided by journals may enhance the value of the review and should be welcomed.

Journals generally may require shorter reviews than those published in *CDSR*. Selective shortening of reviews may be appropriate, but there should not be any substantive differences between the review as published in the journal and *CDSR*. If a review is published in a journal, it should be noted that a fuller and maintained version of the review is available in *CDSR*. Typically, this should be done by including a statement such as the following in the introduction: 'A more detailed review will be published and updated in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews.' The reference should be to the protocol for the review published in *CDSR*. A similar statement should be included in the introduction if a review is published in *CDSR* prior to publishing a version of the review in a journal. After a version of a Cochrane review has been published in a journal, a reference to the journal publication must be added under the heading 'Other published versions of this review'. Authors are also encouraged to add the following statement to versions of Cochrane reviews that are published in journals:

*'This paper is based on a Cochrane review first published [or most recently substantively amended, as appropriate] in The Cochrane Library YYYY, Issue X (see [www.thecochranelibrary.com](http://www.thecochranelibrary.com) for information). Cochrane reviews are regularly updated as new evidence emerges and in response to comments and criticisms, and The Cochrane Library should be consulted for the most recent version of the review.'*

The following modification of the disclaimer published in *The Cochrane Library* should be added to Cochrane reviews published in journals.

*'The results of a Cochrane review can be interpreted differently, depending on people's perspectives and circumstances. Please consider the conclusions presented carefully. They are the opinions of review authors, and are not necessarily shared by The Cochrane Collaboration.'*

The passage below can be provided to journal editors upon submission of a review for publication, and the letter of submission should be copied to the CRG editorial base for information. This policy and procedure may be new to some journal editors and may require direct discussion with the journal editor. The CRG editorial base should be informed of any problems encountered in this process. The following passage is suggested for inclusion in letters of submission to journal editors:

*'This systematic review has been prepared under the aegis of The Cochrane Collaboration, an international organisation that aims to help people make well-informed decisions about healthcare by preparing, maintaining and promoting the accessibility of systematic reviews of the effects of healthcare interventions. The Collaboration's publication policy permits journals to publish reviews, with priority if required, but permits The Cochrane Collaboration also to publish and disseminate such reviews. Cochrane reviews cannot be subject to the exclusive copyright requested by some journals.'*

---

## **Clarification from Wiley regarding permission to republish material**

There has been some recent confusion and concern regarding the policies and processes for obtaining permission to republish material published in *The Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* elsewhere, most particularly in print journals. We hope that the following explanations will help to clarify the situation.

### **New Licence for Publication Form**

Firstly, it is important to realise that the new Form does not require authors to assign any extra rights to The Cochrane Collaboration than the previous form. In fact, the new form states additional authors' rights for what they can do with their review.

As previously, authors are required to assign an exclusive licence to The Cochrane Collaboration to publish their review in electronic editions of *The Cochrane Library*, and to prepare reprints of that review in print form.

The new Form also offers authors the opportunity to assign worldwide print rights to The Cochrane Collaboration for publication in print publications. The reason that this option has been included is that Wiley is currently investigating the possibility of launching at least one Cochrane Journal. We think that the Collaboration having its own journal(s) will offer authors the opportunity to gain print citations and even higher

profile for their reviews. We would hope that the Journal(s) would fast become the preferred option for republication of Cochrane reviews in print form. This will also be an effective way of increasing the profile of the work of the Collaborative Review Groups. However, we recognise that some authors might wish to continue submitting versions of their Cochrane review for print publication elsewhere and this is why the new Form allows them to retain the print rights if they so wish.

### **Permission to Republish in Print**

If authors wish to republish their review, in complete or shortened form, elsewhere in a print journal they are required to seek permission from Wiley. This is the same procedure as for the previous publishing arrangement, when authors had to seek permission from Update Software.

To make such a request to Wiley please complete a Copyright Permission Request Form, and send to the Permissions Department at the address shown on the form . Permission will be granted provided that reference will be made in the republished version to the original publication source (*The Cochrane Library*). There will be no charge for such a request.

If another publisher requests permission to republish a Cochrane Review then they will be instructed to seek also the permission of the authors. A charge will be levied on the other publisher for such a request to cover administrative costs. This is a routine arrangement within publishing and we think it is justified because the publisher is acquiring valuable content to publish, and the expectation should be that some financial value should be assigned to the right to republish. The charge levied is lower than the true value of the content because we recognise that the extra dissemination provided by the republication is a positive.

A similar charging policy will be adopted if another publisher requests permission to translate and republish a Cochrane Review in another journal.

*Deborah Dixon  
John Wiley & Sons Ltd  
02 July 2003*

---

## **Co-publication agreements & correspondence with journal editors re publishing Cochrane Reviews**

(Information taken from The Cochrane Collaboration. The Cochrane Manual Issue 4, 2005 [updated 24 August 2005]. <http://www.cochrane.org/admin/manual.htm> (accessed 2nd November 2005))

### **APPENDIX 1**

## **Co-publication agreements & correspondence with journal editors re publishing Cochrane Reviews**

## 1. Co-publication agreements have been made with the following journals:

American Journal of Gastroenterology  
Anesthesia and Analgesia [see correspondence below]  
Archives of Dermatology  
British Journal of Dermatology  
British Journal of Surgery [see correspondence below]  
British Medical Journal  
BMJ Publishing Group's specialist journals (all)  
Cancer Treatment Review (CTR) [see editorial in CTR 2003;29:149]  
Climacteric [see correspondence below]  
Cochlear Implants International [see ENT Group correspondence below]  
Colorectal Disease [see correspondence below]  
Diseases of Colon and Rectum  
European Journal of Vascular and Endovascular Surgery (EJVES)  
Health Education Journal [see correspondence below]  
Human Reproduction  
HNO [see ENT Group correspondence below]  
International Journal of Epidemiology [see correspondence below]  
International Journal of Pediatric Otorhinolaryngology [see ENT Group correspondence below]  
JAMA [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Audiological Medicine [see ENT Group correspondence below]  
Journal of General Internal Medicine [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Health Services Research and Policy [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Human Hypertension [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Laryngology and Otology [see ENT Group correspondence below]  
Journal of the American Academy of Dermatology  
Journal of the National Cancer Institute [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Rheumatology [see correspondence below]  
Journal of Wound, Ostomy and Continence Nursing (Journal of WOCN)  
Lancet, The [see correspondence below]  
Obstetrics and Gynecology [see correspondence below]  
South African Medical Journal [see correspondence below]  
Stroke

## 2. Correspondence from journal editors re publishing Cochrane Reviews:

From: jane cracknell [mailto:jane\_cracknell@yahoo.com]  
Sent: 13 October 2004 11:31  
To: Jini Hetherington  
Cc: Tom Pedersen; Ann Møller  
Subject: Re: [Adminors] Co-publication agreements with paper journals

CARG has a dual publication arrangement with Anesthesia and Analgesia. The arrangement is as follows: All newly published CARG abstracts are sent to Anesthesia and Analgesia by CARG. The editor in chief then decides whether to accept the shortened version of the review (which will appear in the new A&A Cochrane Corner) or to invite the author to submit the full version of the review. Full versions of the review still need to go through A&A's editorial process. Reference is made to the original Cochrane review.

Best wishes  
Jane Cracknell  
RGC, Cochrane Anaesthesia Review Group (CARG)

XX

From: DStark@wiley.co.uk [mailto:DStark@wiley.co.uk]  
Sent: 15 January 2004 11:51  
To: mclarke@cochrane.co.uk  
Subject: British Journal of Surgery and Cochrane

Dear Mike,

I am writing to extend an invitation to submit Cochrane Reviews to the British Journal of Surgery for publication. We anticipate that the arrangements would be similar to those of Lancet in that we would be interested in parallel publication of course, but also submission of completed and approved Reviews published in *The Cochrane Library* or not. We would also require the manuscript to transit our peer-review process and be revised accordingly. In addition, BJS reviews are heavily edited to ensure their content reads well. Therefore the final paper might be quite different from the original manuscript and Cochrane Review, to which we would of course make full reference. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions, and I look forward to helping to share relevant Cochrane Reviews with the larger surgical community.

Kind regards,  
David Stark,  
Managing Editor, British Journal of Surgery, John Wiley and Sons Ltd  
The Atrium, Southern Gate, Chichester, PO19 8SQ, UK (tel: + 44 (0)1243 770 384; fax: + 44 (0)1243 770 460). Visit the British Journal of Surgery online at [www.bjs.co.uk](http://www.bjs.co.uk)

From: Mike Clarke (mclarke@cochrane.co.uk)  
Sent: 15 January 2004  
To: David Stark (dstark@wiley.co.uk)  
Subject: British Journal of Surgery and Cochrane

Dear David,

Thanks very much for this email. I am copying it to Jini Hetherington in The Cochrane Collaboration Secretariat so that the British Journal of Surgery can be included in the list of journals that have offered this. In addition, if you have no objection, I would like to include your email alongside the related ones from other journals, in the relevant appendix of The Cochrane Manual. This is available on the Internet (<http://www.cochrane.org/admin/manual.htm>) and provides an easy way for Cochrane authors to see what the requirements of your journal would be.

Thanks again.  
Best wishes,  
Mike.

From: DStark@wiley.co.uk [mailto:DStark@wiley.co.uk]  
Sent: 15 January 2004 16:38  
To: Mike Clarke  
Subject: British Journal of Surgery and Cochrane

Dear Mike, Many thanks for your prompt reply. Please feel free to use my email in this way, and I look forward to relaying your news to all the members of the British Journal of Surgery Society.

Kind regards,  
David.

XX

To: CCInfo, 6 February 2003  
From: Thilo Kober thilo.kober@medizin.uni-koeln.de  
Subject: Cancer Treatment Review (CTR) Invites Cochrane Reviews

The Editorial Base of the Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Group (CHMG) has been approached by the biomedical journal 'Cancer Treatment Review' (CTR) to invite authors to publish their Cochrane Reviews that have already appeared in *The Cochrane Library*. CTR has a long tradition of publishing and has a decent impact factor (~3.5). CTR and a previous oncology journal, Evidence-based Oncology (EBO), have merged late last year. The previous editor of EBO, Ben Djulbegovic, is now responsible for commissioning/reviewing systematic reviews for CTR. Ben is also an editor and reviewer/ author of the CHMG. As there is no biomedical journal specialising in systematic reviews to date, this would be a great opportunity to showcase Cochrane Reviews and to enhance promoting the accessibility of systematic reviews of the effects of health care interventions. For more information please contact Dr Djulbegovic per Email on: DjulbeBM@moffitt.usf.edu

XX

From: Alastair MacLennan [mailto:alastair.maclennan@adelaide.edu.au]  
Sent: Monday, 11 October 2004 3:14 p.m.  
To: Michelle Proctor  
Subject: Co-publication agreements with paper journals

Dear Michelle,

Climacteric, The Journal of the International Menopause Society, will regularly publish relevant abstracts from Cochrane Reviews when submitted by the authors or review group co-ordinators with authors permission.

Climacteric also invites authors of reviews on topics related to women's long term health to submit electronically for early publication abridged reviews under 3000 words.

Climacteric is an Index Medicus listed, peer reviewed scientific journal with the widest international circulation of any scientific journal on the menopause and related issues.

Articles are usually peer reviewed within one month and when accepted usually can have early publication.

Kind regards, Alastair

Professor Alastair H. MacLennan  
Co-Editor-in-Chief CLIMACTERIC,  
Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology  
Women's and Children's Hospital  
Adelaide University, AUSTRALIA 5005  
Ph : +61 8 8161 7619/7000+Page  
Fax : +61 8 8161 7652  
e-mail: alastair.maclennan@adelaide.edu.au

XX

Extract from CCCG newsletter:

***The Cochrane Library* and the journal, *Colorectal Disease***



From: Taryn Young, South African Cochrane Centre  
To: Jini Hetherington, Cochrane Collaboration Secretariat  
Date: 17 March 2005

I wish to inform you of the Cochrane Column in the International Journal of Epidemiology (IJE). I have been approached by the editors of the IJE to coordinate a 'Cochrane Column'. The aim of the Column is to highlight Cochrane systematic reviews, especially those with public health implications, and stimulate debate and comments on the relevance, feasibility (availability, accessibility, acceptability, technical skill required, etc.), how it might change practice, or barriers to changing practice. The product will be 1-2 pages in the IJE with the summary of a Cochrane review and comments by experts (clinicians, economists, policy makers) side by side. I thought that it would be good if this could be included with the list of co-publications in the Cochrane Manual.

XX

From: Drummond Rennie, Deputy Editor, JAMA  
Sent: February 2001  
To: Mike Clarke, Cochrane Collaboration Steering Group  
Subject: Publishing Cochrane Reviews

Dear Mike,

I have drawn your recent correspondence with Richard Horton, of the Lancet, to the attention of Dr Cathy DeAngelis, editor in chief of JAMA, and the other JAMA editors.

We, too, recognize that there is good evidence that Cochrane Reviews are better than other systematic reviews and we wish to attract the best of these. We have examined our journal policies and feel that they provide very few barriers to good new Cochrane Reviews at the cutting edge of medicine.

As before, JAMA welcomes systematic reviews and manuscripts from The Cochrane Collaboration, and has published these in the past. Our policy concerning such manuscripts is that, in general, we like to publish the message in JAMA before it appears in *the Cochrane Library*. However, we handle all manuscripts on an individual basis and are certainly prepared to consider for publication manuscripts describing reviews that have already appeared in the Library. Obviously, the message of the two reports will be the same but the two documents would have many differences. We would, of course, get peer review and usually require revision.

JAMA has an excellent record of publishing systematic reviews and we intend to continue this.

I send my best regards, Drummond.

**Further information provided by Drummond Rennie on 14 January 2004:**

JAMA will require that its version of the Cochrane review be published before the companion full Cochrane review is published in *The Cochrane Library*, even if this is only a few days before. JAMA will consider updates of existing Cochrane Reviews only if the update contains what the journal editors would classify as very substantial new information."

XX

Extract from CCInfo, 20 January 2005:

D. Sender: Victor M. Montori, M.D. [Montori.Victor@mayo.edu]  
Subject: JGIM Call for Cochrane Reviews

I think the editorial published in the December issue of the Journal of General Internal Medicine may be of interest to all Cochranites. In this editorial (**see full text below**), we call for Cochrane authors to submit versions of their reviews for publication in JGIM:

Montori, Victor M., Saha, Somnath & Clarke, Mike (2004) A Call for Systematic Reviews. *Journal of General Internal Medicine* 19 (12), 1240-1241. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1497.2004.41001.x

More information about JGIM is at  
<http://www.blackwellpublishing.com/journal.asp?ref=0884-8734&site=1>

Cheers,  
Victor

Victor M. Montori, MD, MSc  
Assistant Professor of Medicine  
Division of Diabetes, Endocrinology, and Medicine  
Knowledge & Encounter Research Unit  
SPARC Innovation Program - Mayo E17  
Mayo Clinic College of Medicine  
200 First Street SW, Rochester MN 55905  
Voice 507 284 2617  
Fax 507 284 5745

\*\*\*\*\*

*Journal of General Internal Medicine* 2004;19 (12), 1240-1241.

#### EDITORIAL: A Call for Systematic Reviews

In this editorial, we discuss the power of systematic reviews and their central role in evidence-based practice, and we encourage authors of systematic reviews to submit them for publication in *Journal of General Internal Medicine*.

Most clinical care research studies enroll patients who represent only a narrow spectrum of those to whom clinicians may wish to apply the results.<sup>1</sup> Also, most studies are not large enough on their own to measure precisely all relevant patient-important outcomes, for instance, both benefits and harms of therapy. Small studies often produce indeterminate or contradictory results. One potential solution is to conduct large clinical studies enrolling a wide variety of patients and measuring all patient-important outcomes with precision.<sup>2</sup> An alternative is to summarize and synthesize existing evidence in a systematic review.

In contrast to a nonsystematic review (i.e., the majority of narrative reviews and book chapters), a systematic review typically allows readers to appraise how the review was conducted and the evidence synthesized. Rather than being all encompassing, systematic reviews focus on a single question or a small set of closely related questions. In offering an answer, authors might decide to pool the results of individual studies using statistical techniques, a procedure called meta-analysis. Not all systematic reviews allow for such pooling. Also, not all meta-analyses pool the results of studies identified systematically. In this communication, we refer to both systematic reviews and to the meta-analyses conducted across studies included in systematic reviews.

Clinicians can trust the validity of a systematic review to the extent that it was conducted rigorously using protocols to implement safeguards against bias in assembling, critically appraising, and synthesizing the evidence. High quality reviews also systematically explore and explain between-study differences. Such systematic reviews may yield valid, precise, and widely applicable answers to focused clinical questions. 3 Thus, systematic reviews have come to play a central role in 1) informing clinical decisions and guidelines and 2) identifying knowledge gaps for researchers and funding agencies. Because of their power to aid both clinicians and researchers, *JGIM* encourages authors of systematic reviews to submit them for publication in our journal.

The idea of systematically synthesizing research evidence began to emerge in the 18th and 19th centuries. In their historical account of evidence synthesis, Chalmers, Hedges, and Cooper noted that work published as early as 1904 in England and 1907 in the United States shared features with modern meta-analyses.<sup>4</sup> Meta-analytic techniques evolved and matured in agriculture and the social sciences and preceded the identification of mechanisms to prevent bias in research synthesis. It was in the late 1980s and early 1990s that research documented the shortcomings of narrative reviews (and of the recommendations included in them).<sup>5–7</sup> Consequently, the number of systematic reviews and meta-analyses increased, and methodologists published criteria by which the quality of a systematic review could be judged.<sup>8,9</sup>

In 1993, an international group of authors and methodologists established the Cochrane Collaboration. 10 In 1995, they produced the first issue of the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews containing the full text of the first 36 Cochrane systematic reviews. Since the mid-1990s, the Cochrane Collaboration has promoted the methods of systematic reviews and has now prepared and disseminated more than 2000 systematic reviews of the effects of health care interventions and is endeavoring to keep all of these up to date. Researchers at York University in the United Kingdom have assembled the Database of Abstracts of Reviews of Effects (DARE) to list all systematic reviews in health care, not just those produced by the Cochrane Collaboration.<sup>11</sup> Both DARE and the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews are published in *The Cochrane Library* ([www.thecochranelibrary.com](http://www.thecochranelibrary.com)).

In 1997, the Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (now the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality; AHRQ) began funding Evidence-based Practice Centers (EPCs) to conduct systematic reviews, collected in *evidence reports*, to answer specific questions about clinical conditions that are common, expensive, and relevant to the Medicare and Medicaid population of the United States.<sup>12</sup> Over 100 evidence reports have resulted from this effort, conducted in 13 EPCs across North America. The summaries and complete evidence reports are available on the EPC program's website (<http://www.ahrq.gov/clinic/epc/>).

Full Cochrane Reviews and EPC evidence reports are published online. The electronic publication of these reviews facilitates their maintenance by allowing authors to update them as new relevant evidence emerges. And while the Cochrane Reviews are available in full text with a subscription to the Cochrane Library (or through national licenses in some countries) and the EPC evidence reports are available for free on the AHRQ website, most clinicians never access these reviews. Moreover, clinicians who do access these reports may have difficulty using them, as they are typically very detailed and lengthy documents written for a wide audience and formatted in a way that may hinder clinicians' ability to efficiently and quickly appraise and apply their results in practice. The findings of Cochrane Reviews and EPC evidence reports therefore typically reach the practicing general internist's awareness only when summarized and published in peer-reviewed clinical journals.

Why should authors submit systematic reviews to *JGIM*? We believe that when authors of systematic reviews (including Cochrane Reviews and EPC evidence reports) prepare reports

for publication in peer-reviewed clinical journals such as *JGIM* and adhere to journal instruction and reporting guidelines (such as QUORUM13 for systematic reviews of randomized trials or MOOSE 14 for systematic reviews of observational studies), their reviews gain in readability and their message disseminates with greater ease among the target audience. Systematic reviews published in *JGIM* may get additional dissemination through press releases, circulation of our table of contents by e-mail, access online via the *JGIM* website, and publication in secondary journals that scan and highlight high-quality articles published in *JGIM* (e.g., *ACP Journal Club*). Furthermore, *JGIM* authors and deputy editors may assist authors in optimizing the quality and clarity of their reports for the *Journal's* target audience.

In 2000, 80% of all systematic reviews were published in 11% of all clinical journals (including the Cochrane Library, which published 56% of these): 5 of the 9 reviews published in *JGIM* that year were rigorous systematic reviews.<sup>15</sup> Systematic reviews published in these journals received significantly more citations than narrative reviews published in the same journals.<sup>15</sup> Thus, both authors and journals can benefit from the publication of systematic reviews.

To further facilitate the publication of Cochrane Reviews and EPC evidence reports, we have ensured that our policies regarding copyright and duplicate publication are consistent with those of the Cochrane Collaboration (<http://www.cochrane.org/admin/manual.htm>) and AHRQ (personal communication, Kenneth Fink, MD, MGA, MPH, September 7, 2004). Publication in *JGIM* will not limit dissemination of the Cochrane review or EPC evidence report in any way. Specifically, publication of full Cochrane Reviews in the Cochrane Library and EPC evidence reports by AHRQ will not disqualify manuscripts derived from those reviews from consideration by *JGIM*. Authors of Cochrane Reviews will retain copyright. Furthermore, to the extent that a protocol or the complete review is available in the Cochrane Library, the *JGIM* publication will point readers to this repository, noting that this is where the full review and any updates will be available. We will encourage authors of Cochrane Reviews to cite the *JGIM* publication in the text of their Cochrane Reviews, thereby drawing the attention of readers of the Cochrane review to a publication that might be more suited to some clinicians. A similar practice of cross-citation, when possible, will alert *JGIM* readers to the complete EPC evidence reports in the AHRQ website.

*Journal of General Internal Medicine* aims to be a premier general medical journal and to continue to meet the needs of all our readers. We believe we can further our mission by publishing rigorous and useful systematic reviews of important topics relevant to our areas of focus: clinical care and health services research, patient-clinician communication, and medical education.<sup>16</sup> Systematic reviews submitted to *JGIM* do not need to be limited to the assessment of effectiveness of interventions; reviews of diagnosis and screening (test performance, clinical manifestations of disease, disease probability, and clinical prediction rules), harm and prognosis, and other aspects of potential relevance to our readers are welcome. We look forward to the opportunity to consider your systematic reviews for publication in *JGIM*.

VICTOR M. **MONTORI**, MD, MSc, *Mayo Clinic College of Medicine, Rochester, Minn*;  
SOMNATH **SAHA**, MD, MPH, *Portland VA Medical Center and Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, Ore*; and MIKE **CLARKE**, DPhil, *UK Cochrane Centre, Oxford, England*.

## REFERENCES

1. Yusuf S, Held P, Teo KK, Toretzky ER. Selection of patients for randomized controlled trials: implications of wide or narrow eligibility criteria. *Stat Med*. 1990;9:73–83; discussion 83–6.
2. Yusuf S, Collins R, Peto R. Why do we need some large, simple randomized trials? *Stat Med*. 1984;3:409–22.

3. Oxman A, Guyatt GH, Cook D, Montori V. Summarizing the evidence. In: Guyatt GH, Rennie D, eds. *Users' Guides to the Medical Literature. A Manual for Evidence-based Clinical Practice*. Chicago, Ill: AMA Press; 2002:155–73.
4. Chalmers I, Hedges LV, Cooper H. A brief history of research synthesis. *Eval Health Prof*. 2002;25:12–37.
5. Mulrow CD. The medical review article: state of the science. *Ann Intern Med*. 1987;106:485–8.
6. McAlister FA, Clark HD, van Walraven C, et al. The medical review article revisited: has the science improved? *Ann Intern Med*. 1999;131:947–51.
7. Antman EM, Lau J, Kupelnick B, Mosteller F, Chalmers TC. A comparison of results of meta-analyses of randomized control trials and recommendations of clinical experts. *Treatments for myocardial infarction*. *JAMA*. 1992;268:240–8.
8. Oxman AD, Guyatt GH. Validation of an index of the quality of review articles. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 1991;44:1271–8.
9. Oxman AD, Cook DJ, Guyatt GH. *Users' guides to the medical literature*. VI. How to use an overview. Evidence-based Medicine Working Group. *JAMA*. 1994;272:1367–71.
10. Chalmers I. The Cochrane Collaboration: preparing, maintaining, and disseminating systematic reviews of the effects of health care. *Ann N Y Acad Sci*. 1993;703:156–63; discussion 163–5.
11. Petticrew M, Song F, Wilson P, Wright K. Quality-assessed reviews of health care interventions and the database of abstracts of reviews of effectiveness (DARE). NHS CRD Review, Dissemination, and Information Teams. *Int J Technol Assess Health Care*. 1999;15:671–8.
12. Graham J. Perspectives. AHCPR's evidence-based centers: will their findings guide clinical practice? *Med Health*. 1998;52(suppl):1–4.
13. Moher D, Cook DJ, Eastwood S, Olkin I, Rennie D, Stroup DF. Improving the quality of reports of meta-analyses of randomized controlled trials: the QUORUM statement. *Quality of Reporting of Meta-analyses*. *Lancet*. 1999;354:1896–900.
14. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Metaanalysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA*. 2000;283:2008–12.
15. Montori VM, Wilczynski NL, Morgan D, Haynes RB. Systematic reviews: a cross-sectional study of location and citation counts. *BMC Med*. 2003;1:2.
16. Gerrity MS, Tierney WM. Stepping up to the plate. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2004;19:805–7.

XX

From: Jeremy Grimshaw, Co-ordinating Editor, EPOC Group  
 Sent: 23 June 2000  
 To: CCInfo  
 Subject: Agreement for co-publication in JHSRP and The Cochrane Library

The editors and publisher of the Journal of Health Services Research and Policy (<http://www.lshtm.ac.uk/php/hsru/jhsrp/j-aims.htm>) have agreed to co-publication of Cochrane Reviews (as outlined in section 2.3 of the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions).

Best wishes, Jeremy

XX

From: Gregory Lip [mailto:g.y.h.lip@bham.ac.uk]  
 Sent: 20 October 2004 13:53  
 To: mclarke@cochrane.co.uk  
 Cc: h.g.maxwell@ed.ac.uk; Gareth Beevers (E-mail)  
 Subject: Journal of Human Hypertension and Cochrane

Dear Mike,

I am writing to extend an invitation to submit Cochrane Reviews to the Journal of Human Hypertension for publication. Gareth Beevers (Editor in Chief) and I (as Editor) anticipate that the arrangements would be similar to those of Lancet in that we would be interested in parallel publication of course, but also submission of completed and approved Reviews published in The Cochrane Library.

We would also require the manuscript to transit our peer-review process and be revised accordingly. In addition, JHH reviews are edited to ensure their content reads well. Therefore the final paper might be quite different from the original manuscript and Cochrane Review, to which we would of course make full reference. Please feel free to contact me should you have any questions, and I look forward to helping to share relevant Cochrane Reviews with the larger hypertension community.

For JHH website, see [www.nature.com/jhh](http://www.nature.com/jhh)

Kind regards,  
Greg

Gregory YH Lip  
Consultant Cardiologist and Professor of Cardiovascular Medicine  
Director - Haemostasis Thrombosis & Vascular Biology Unit  
Editor - Journal of Human Hypertension

University Department of Medicine  
City Hospital  
Birmingham B18 7QH  
England UK

Tel: +44 121 5075080; Fax: +44 121 554 4083;  
Email: [g.y.h.lip@bham.ac.uk](mailto:g.y.h.lip@bham.ac.uk)

Webpage:<http://www.swbh.nhs.uk/teaching/medicine/medhome.htm>  
[Sandwell & West Birmingham Hospitals NHS Trust]

XX

1 October 2003

Prof Andreas Engert  
Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Group  
Klinik I für Innere Medizin  
Universitätsklinikum Köln  
50924 Köln  
Germany

Dear Prof. Engert:

Thank you for your letter of 12 September proposing a collaboration between the Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Group (CHMG) and the JNCI. Indeed, we are very interested in the collaboration you propose and would be happy for the CHMG to submit completed and approved Cochrane Reviews to JNCI for possible publication. As you note, the actual publication decision would depend on the outcome of the review process. However, I would

commit to sending all such submissions for full peer review - that is, they would not be subject to editorial board rejection in advance of peer review.

I do have several questions about the process you envisage. First, I want to be sure that a review that is submitted to JNCI will not be submitted to any other journal at the same time that it is under consideration at JNCI. Second, I believe that full versions of Cochrane Reviews are available online only through the Cochrane library, and I want to be certain that online publication of the JNCI version of any Cochrane review (and, as you note, these will differ) will not violate any of Cochrane's provisions. Third, could you clarify the relative timing of publication—would the Cochrane review appear before the JNCI version, or would mechanisms be established to publish the two versions simultaneously?

We would also be interested in the biannual report of recent ongoing and published randomized controlled trials from the CHMG Specialised Trials Register. Are there any restrictions on what we can do with this report? For example, it might be something that we would include online only as part of JNCI Cancer Spectrum (which includes not only the online version of JNCI but also many other contents as well—including, as you may know, abstracts of Cochrane Reviews relevant to cancer). Would this approach to publishing the report be acceptable to CHMG and the Cochrane Collaboration?

We agree that a collaboration between JNCI and CHMG will be beneficial to both the Journal, in giving it access to high-quality systematic reviews, and the CHMG, in disseminating the reviews as widely as possible. Thank you for proposing the collaboration, and I look forward to working with you.

Yours sincerely,  
Barnett S. Kramer  
Editor-in-Chief, Journal of the National Cancer Institute

XX

From: Debbie Morton, Cochrane Neurological Network  
Sent: 10 October 2002  
To: CCInfo  
Subject: Publishing policy revised in response to Cochrane efforts

The Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery and Psychiatry (JNNP) was approached by a team of neurological Cochrane collaborators in June with a proposal aimed at persuading the Journal to revise its publishing policy to allow for the acceptance of Cochrane Reviews. In July, the Journal notified Dr. Carl Clarke, reader in clinical neurology and consultant neurologist for the University of Birmingham, that his efforts in spearheading the campaign together with the Cochrane Neurological Network and other Cochrane collaborators had been successful. The Journal's editorial board agreed to revise its policy to allow Cochrane Reviews to be considered for publication, provided they be edited for length and readability.

Additionally, the Journal took interest in the concept of a 'Cochrane Corner' proposed by Professor Peter Sandercock, co-ordinating editor of the Cochrane Stroke Group. The Journal agreed to a revised 'evidence-based corner' to be published in each month's issue, similar to the one recently introduced in the journal, 'Stroke'. The evidence-based corner will provide a brief summary of an evidence-based review along with critical comments by an author. It will appear in each month's issue and will span two pages.

Debbie Morton  
Cochrane Neurological Network  
Dipartimento di Scienze Neurologiche  
Ospedale Maggiore Policlinico

Via F. Sforza, 35  
20122 Milan, Italy  
Tel: +39 0255033831 or +39 0250320434  
Fax: +39 0250320430  
Email: cochrane.neuronet@unimi.it  
Website: http://www.cochraneneuronet.org

XX

From: Peter Tugwell, Co-ordinating Editor, Musculoskeletal Group  
Sent: 18 September 2002  
To: DA Gordon, Journal of Rheumatology, 920 Yonge Street, Suite 115, Toronto, On, Canada M4W 3C74  
Re: Simultaneous publication of Cochrane Reviews in *The Journal of Rheumatology*

Thank you for the confirmation of your support of the arrangements to submit our Cochrane Reviews simultaneously to *The Journal of Rheumatology* and the Cochrane Library. This letter is to ensure that we are clear on the process.

As discussed, upon submission we will send you:

- 1) A cover letter endorsing the Cochrane review
- 2) Copies of two external referees' assessments of the Cochrane review
- 3) Four copies of the Cochrane review, including tables and graphs, as well as an electronic copy on disk as per *The Journal of Rheumatology* author guidelines.

We understand that Cochrane Reviews submitted by this process will not normally be peer-reviewed again, and the time frame for publication may vary from time of submission but will usually be between three to six months. In *The Cochrane Library* the Cochrane review will cite *The Journal of Rheumatology* as a co-publication when posted (or cited as "in press" if posted prior to print publication). We anticipate that *The Journal of Rheumatology* might receive approximately 8 Cochrane Reviews for publication a year.

Many thanks for your ongoing support of The Cochrane Collaboration and, in particular, the Cochrane Musculoskeletal Review Group.

Sincerely,  
Peter Tugwell.

XX

From: Richard Horton, Editor, The Lancet  
Sent: 11 January 2001  
To: 'mclarke@cochrane.co.uk'; 'ichalmers@cochrane.co.uk'  
Subject: Lancet and Cochrane

Dear Mike and Iain - I am writing following our very positive conversation yesterday about The Lancet's policy regarding Cochrane systematic reviews.

We agreed two important facts. First, that there is overwhelming evidence that Cochrane Reviews are of higher quality than non-Cochrane reviews. Second, that, for the time being at least, Cochrane is not always successful at disseminating the results of these reviews to the people who need them - often ordinary doctors.



25th August, 2000

Professor Peter Sandercock  
Professor of Medical Neurology  
Coordinating Editor, Cochrane Stroke Group  
Department of Clinical Neurosciences  
Western General Hospital NHS Trust  
Crewe Road  
Edinburgh EH4 2XU  
UNITED KINGDOM

Dear Peter

RE: COCHRANE FEATURE IN STROKE

Thank you for your letter dated 6th June, 2000 in which you follow-up on our initial discussion at the European Stroke Conference in Vienna about the proposal to publish a regular quarterly feature in the **Stroke** Journal entitled "Cochrane Library Update". It is proposed new reviews or substantive updates of existing reviews that have been published in full by the Cochrane Stroke Group as part of the Cochrane Library Update could also be published in short form in **Stroke**, with the content being either the abstract, implications for practice and implications for research, and a single figure (generally the effect of the intervention on the primary measure of outcome) or alternatively a short newsletter-style piece with a short report or commentary on recent new reviews or updates.

We will also consider whether any spare space on the Cochrane Library Update page in the Journal could be allocated for giving notice of forthcoming activities (e.g. workshops) and relevant website addresses.

Of course, full text articles derived from the Cochrane Reviews, but abbreviated, may also be submitted for publication in **Stroke** as original articles and follow the usual peer review process.

Finally, as the Stroke Journal is one of a family of journals under the direction of the American Heart Association, we will liaise with our editorial colleagues from the journal **Circulation** and explore whether the Cochrane Heart Group may be able to seek a similar arrangement with **Circulation**.

Yours sincerely  
**Dr Graeme J. Hankey**  
Associate Editor/**Stroke**

XX

26 November 2001

To all Cochrane ENT Group authors and co-authors:

Dear colleagues

Further to my e-mail message of 15th June regarding the interest of the Lancet and JAMA in receiving manuscripts of Cochrane Reviews for consideration for co-publication, I am

