

Dual Two-Pass Screening

Dual Two-Pass screening is a sequential, quality controlled screening process that has two steps. In the first step, two users sequentially Advance or Exclude articles at the Abstract level. Any disagreements at this step are adjudicated by an Admin. In the second step, two users conduct a Full Text Review and Include or Exclude articles. All disagreements this second step must also be adjudicated by an Admin.

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

Configure Exclusion Reasons

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

Configure Dual Two-Pass Screening

Navigate to Settings and select "Dual" and "Two-Pass"

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



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 Two-Pass Screening Steps:

1. Screen each study twice at the abstract level.

Two independent reviewers will need to review the abstract of every study and [screen](#) the abstracts using the same approach as Standard Screening Mode with the exception that studies are only advanced to full-text screening at this stage instead of included. AutoLit automatically queues the abstracts to all users until two screening decisions are made; then, the abstracts are sent forward for adjudication.

The screenshot displays the AutoLit Abstract Screening interface. The main panel shows the abstract of a study titled "Novel GLP-1 (Glucagon-Like Peptide-1) Analogues and Insulin in the Treatment for Alzheimer's Disease and Other Neurodegenerative Diseases." The interface includes a left sidebar with navigation options like "Abstract Screening", "Full Text Screening", and "Tagging". The right sidebar shows a "Navigation" panel with "Abstract Screening" selected, displaying a list of reasons for exclusion and an "Advance" button. The "Advance" button is highlighted with a red box. Below the "Advance" button, the text "This study is associated with (0) screening decisions." is visible.

In Dual modes, it can be useful to view the number of prior reviewers for the current record. This is displayed to the right of the advance button (see below). It is also displayed next to the include button in Full Text screening. 0 means no decisions have been made about the current record, 1 means 1 reviewer has made a decision, and so on.

The screenshot displays the AutoLit Abstract Screening interface, similar to the previous one, but with the "Advance" button highlighted by a red box. Below the "Advance" button, the text "This study is associated with (0) screening decisions." is visible.

Even in Abstract Screening, you may want to view the full text, to do so go to the Full Text tab. In

Dual Screening types, the status of whether the full text has been uploaded or not 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 and is not shown in the Full Text Screening module since all full texts will be uploaded.

2. Adjudicate decision for abstracts

There is an option to [auto-adjudicate](#). For any study that is not Auto-Adjudicated, an Admin will need to manually adjudicate in order to provide a final screening decision on the abstracts. The Admin should choose between selecting the decision of Screener 1 or Screener 2, or if both are incorrect, provide a different option. Once adjudicated, the studies will either be excluded or advanced and sent forward to Full Text Screening.

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](#).

If you have Robot Screener turned on, its decisions will be shown in Abstract Adjudication and not Full Text Adjudication. This is because, in Dual Two Pass mode, Robot Screener only runs on abstracts. Learn more [here](#).

4. Screen the full-text of each study.

Two independent reviewers will need to review the full-text of every study and [screen](#) the abstracts using the same approach as Standard Screening Mode. AutoLit automatically queues the full-texts to all users until two screening decisions are made; then, the articles are sent forward for adjudication.

The screenshot displays the 'Full Text Screening' interface for a study titled 'HEALTH TECHNOLOGY ASSESSMENT'. The main content area shows the title, volume (21), issue (9), date (March 2017), and ISSN (1366-5278). Below this, the title is repeated in green: 'Oral anticoagulants for primary prevention, treatment and secondary prevention of venous thromboembolic disease, and for prevention of stroke in atrial fibrillation: systematic review, network meta-analysis and cost-effectiveness analysis'. The authors listed are Jonathan AC Sterne, Pritesh N Bodalia, Peter A Bryden, Philippa A Davies, Jose A López-López, George N Okoli, Howard HZ Thom, Deborah M Caldwell, Sofia Dias, Diane Eaton, Julian PT Higgins, Will Hollingworth, Chris Salisbury, Jelena Savović, Reecha Sofat, Annya Stephens-Boal, Nicky J Welton, and Aroon D Hingorani. On the left sidebar, 'Full Text Screening' is highlighted. On the right sidebar, the 'Full Text Screening' panel shows 'Full Text Review' checked, 'Full Text Uploaded!' status, and a 'Select Reason' dropdown menu. The 'Include' button is highlighted in red.

5. Adjudicate decisions for full-texts

There is an option to [auto-adjudicate](#). For any study that is not Auto-Adjudicated, an Admin will need to manually adjudicate in order to provide a final screening decision on the full-texts. The Admin should choose between selecting the decision of Screener 1 or Screener 2, or if both are incorrect, provide a different option. Once adjudicated, the studies will either be excluded or included.

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](#).

The screenshot displays the 'Adjudicate Screening' interface for the same study. The main content area is identical to the previous screenshot. On the left sidebar, 'Adjudicate Screening' is highlighted. On the right sidebar, the 'Adjudicate Screening' panel shows 'Screening 1' and 'Screening 2' with 'Include' and 'Exclude' buttons respectively. The 'Include' button for Screening 1 is highlighted in red. Below this, the 'Select Different Option' panel shows a 'Select Reason' dropdown menu with options like 'Incorrect Study Type', 'Secondary analysis', 'Editorial', 'Protocol only', 'Does not relate to NSCLC', 'Not an RCT', and 'Reports treatment of side effects'. The 'Include' button is highlighted in red.

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:dualtwopass>

Last update: **2023/12/06 15:38**