

Dual Screening and Adjudication

Dual Screening is a quality-controlled screening process, where two users independently screen each article, and then all screening decisions are adjudicated by an Administrator. Note, this is different than [two-pass screening](#) where a user first reviews abstracts and then full-texts of advanced articles. You can, however, perform [dual two-pass](#) screening in our software.

The Admin adjudicates any disagreement between the original screeners and sets the final determination for each study. For example, if Screener 1 includes a given study but Screener 2 excludes it for Reason 1, the Adjudicator will then need to choose between Inclusion, Excluding for Reason 1, or choosing to Exclude for Reason 2.

Only those with Admin privileges can serve as Adjudicators, but any user can serve as a Screener.



Video

Configure Exclusion Reasons

You will need to [Configure Exclusion Reasons](#) before screening underlying studies.

Configure Dual Screening

To configure dual screening in a nest, click on the “Settings” link under Nest Home. Once there, scroll down to the Screening section. Then, click on the “Dual” option in the (**red box**).

Nest Home

Activity

Settings

Literature Search

Other Sources

Duplicate Review

Search Exploration

Abstract Screening

Adjudicate Screening

Full Text Screening

Adjudicate Screening

Tagging

Study Inspector

Screening

In Standard Screening, one user screens each record. Inclusion sends the record forward for gathering, such as tagging, meta-analytical extraction, and critical appraisal. Exclusion does not queue the record for gathering.

In Dual Screening, two users independently screen each record, and then all screening determinations are reviewed by an administrator. The administrator adjudicates any disagreement between the original screeners to set the final determination for each record.

In Two Pass Screening, all records are first rapidly screened using only title and abstract. Records may be advanced from title/abstract screening to more intensive full text screening, where final inclusion is determined.

In Dual Two Pass Screening, two users rapidly screen all records using only title/abstract and these determinations are reviewed and advanced by an administrator. Two users then screen all full texts and final inclusion is determined by the administrator.

Choose Mode:

☐ Standard

☒ Two Pass

Choose number of reviewers:

☐ Single

☒ Dual

Once this is complete, a new “Adjudicate Screening” option will appear in the Nest Menu for all Admins:

Nest Home

Activity

Settings

Literature Search

Other Sources

Duplicate Review

Search Exploration

Dual Screening

Adjudicate Screening

Tagging

MA Extraction

Critical Appraisal

Study Inspector

1 Jagannathan, 2021

Abstract Full Text Supplements Related Reports

PMC

Peginterferon Lambda-1a for treatment of outpatients with uncomplicated COVID-19: a randomized placebo-controlled trial.

Type III interferons have been touted as promising therapeutics in outpatients with coronavirus disease 2019 (COVID-19). We conducted a randomized, single-blind, placebo-controlled trial (NCT04331899) in 120 outpatients with mild to moderate COVID-19 to determine whether a single, 180 mcg subcutaneous dose of Peginterferon Lambda-1a (Lambda) within 72 hours of diagnosis could shorten the duration of viral shedding (primary endpoint) or symptoms (secondary endpoint). In both the 60 patients receiving Lambda and 60 receiving placebo, the median time to cessation of viral shedding was 7 days (hazard ratio [HR] = 0.81; 95% confidence interval [CI] 0.56 to 1.19). Symptoms resolved in 8 and 9 days in Lambda and placebo, respectively, and symptom duration did not differ significantly between groups (HR 0.94; 95% CI 0.64 to 1.39). Both Lambda and placebo were well-tolerated, though liver transaminase elevations were more common in the Lambda vs. placebo arm (15/60 vs 5/60; p = 0.027). In this study, a single dose of subcutaneous Peginterferon Lambda-1a neither shortened the duration of SARS-CoV-2 viral shedding nor improved symptoms in outpatients with uncomplicated COVID-19.

Population/Problem

Intervention

Outcome

Your Keywords

98 0 81 0



Note: Toggling back from Dual Screening to Standard Screening (or switching to Two-Pass Screening) will ONLY save final adjudications, so all records without an adjudicated Include or Exclude decision will be reverted to Unscreened and **all data associated with individual users' decisions will be lost!**

Dual Screening Steps

1. Screen each study twice

Before Adjudication can take place, two independent users will need to **screen** each underlying study using the same approach as Standard Screening Mode. AutoLit automatically queues the studies to all users until two screening decisions are made; then, the studies are sent forward for adjudication. You may want to view the full text, see instructions on [Full Text Upload](#).

In Dual Screening, it can be useful to view the number of prior reviewers for the current record. This is

displayed to the right of the include button (see below). 0 means no decisions have been made about the current record, 1 means 1 reviewer has made a decision, and so on.

The screenshot shows the 'Dual Screening' interface for a study titled 'Peginterferon Lambda-1a for treatment of outpatients with uncomplicated COVID-19: a randomized placebo-controlled trial'. The interface includes a left sidebar with navigation options like 'Nest Home', 'Literature Search', 'Dual Screening', 'Tagging', 'MA Extraction', 'Critical Appraisal', 'Study Inspector', and 'Synthesis'. The main area displays the study title, abstract, and a 'Full Text' tab. Below the abstract, there are filters for 'Population/Problem', 'Intervention', 'Outcome', and 'Your Keywords'. On the right, a 'Navigation' panel shows 'Dual Screening' with an 'Include' button and a count of 0 screening decisions. A red box highlights the '0' next to the 'Include' button.

However, in Dual modes the status of whether the full text has been uploaded or not by the other reviewer is hidden. This is to avoid bias as the knowledge that the other user has uploaded the record's full text may influence your screening decision. You still have the option to show the full text upload status as well as the full text regardless by clicking "Show Anyways." This action does not affect your screening decisions.

The screenshot shows the 'Dual Screening' interface with a 'Full Text Blinded' modal. The modal text states: 'The full text may or may not be uploaded. Knowing this information may bias your screening decision, by revealing the actions of another reviewer.' Below the text is a 'Show Anyways' button. The background shows the same interface as the previous screenshot, but the 'Full Text' tab is selected.

2. [OPTIONAL] Auto-Adjudicate

All studies that have undergone two screening decisions are sent forward for adjudication, and any study that is either Included by both Screeners or Excluded by both Screeners is eligible for Auto-Adjudication.

To Auto-Adjudicate all eligible studies, navigate to Adjudicate Screening, and in the upper right, select "Auto-adjudicate {x} studies" (red box). This will automatically include all studies that both

Screeners included, and exclude all studies that both Screeners excluded.

If Screener 1 and Screener 2 selected different Exclusion Reasons, the Auto-Adjudication will select only one of these and apply it as the final Exclusion Reason.

AbstractFull TextSupplementsRelated Reports

Tao, 2022

Trial of Endovascular Treatment of Acute Basilar-Artery Occlusion.

BACKGROUND Data from trials investigating the effects and risks of endovascular thrombectomy for the treatment of stroke due to basilar-artery occlusion are limited. METHODS We conducted a multicenter, prospective, randomized, controlled trial of endovascular thrombectomy for basilar-artery occlusion at 36 centers in China. Patients were assigned, in a 2:1 ratio, within 12 hours after the estimated time of basilar-artery occlusion to receive endovascular thrombectomy or best medical care (control). The primary outcome was good functional status, defined as a score of 0 to 3 on the modified Rankin scale (range, 0 [no symptoms] to 6 [death]), at 90 days. Secondary outcomes included a modified Rankin scale score of 0 to 2, distribution across the modified Rankin scale score categories, and quality of life. Safety outcomes included symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage at 24 to 72 hours, 90-day mortality, and procedural complications. RESULTS Of the 507 patients who underwent screening, 340 were in the intention-to-treat population, with 226 assigned to the thrombectomy group and 114 to the control group. Intravenous thrombolysis was used in 31% of the patients in the thrombectomy group and in 34% of those in the control group. Good functional status at 90 days occurred in 104 patients (46%) in the thrombectomy group and in 26 (23%) in the control group (adjusted rate ratio, 2.06; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.46 to 2.91, P<0.001). Symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage occurred in 12 patients (5%) in the thrombectomy group and in none in the control group. Results for the secondary clinical and imaging outcomes were generally in the same direction as those for the primary outcome. Mortality at 90 days was 37% in the thrombectomy group and 55% in the control group (adjusted risk ratio, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.52 to 0.82). Procedural complications occurred in 14% of the patients in the thrombectomy group, including one death due to arterial perforation. CONCLUSIONS In a trial involving Chinese patients with basilar-artery occlusion, approximately one third of whom received intravenous thrombolysis, endovascular thrombectomy within 12 hours after stroke onset led to better functional outcomes at 90 days than best medical care but was associated with procedural complications and intracerebral hemorrhage. (Funded by the Program for Innovative Research Team of the First Affiliated Hospital of USTC and others; ATTENTION ClinicalTrials.gov number, NCT04751708.)

Population/ProblemInterventionOutcome

KeywordsBibliographic fields

Edit

Agreements

Auto Adjudicate 6 Studies

Navigation

BackSkip

Preliminary Screenings

Screening 1:Screening 2:

Exclude (Exclude this because it's the worst)Include

Select Different Option

Full Text ReviewUpload Full Text

Exclude:

Search Reasons

Select Reason

Secondary analysis

Not an RCT

Published Before 2014-01-01

Protocol or Methods article

Does not report use of mechanical thrombectomy

No Intervention of Interest

Meta-Analysis or Systematic Review

Include:

Include

Tagging

Comments (0)

History

3. Adjudicate Disagreements

For any study that is not Auto-Adjudicated, an Admin will need to manually adjudicate in order to provide a final screening decision. The Admin should choose between selecting the decision of Screener 1 or Screener 2, or if both are incorrect, provide a different option (red box). Once adjudicated, the studies will either be excluded or included and sent forward to Tagging.

Note: by default, the names of the reviewers will be displayed alongside their decisions. You may want to reduce bias by hiding this information. To do so you can Blind Adjudication in Settings.

Kappa Statistics for Interrater Reliability

After you finish Dual Screening, you can view the Kappa statistics in Activity.

Guidance on Dual Screening Best Practices

For guidance on best practices in Dual Screening, click here.

From:

<https://wiki.nested-knowledge.com/> - **Nested Knowledge**

Permanent link:

<https://wiki.nested-knowledge.com/doku.php?id=wiki:autolit:screening:dual&rev=1701794942>

Last update: **2023/12/05 16:49**