How many new reviews and updates were published in 2015?

How many of the 447 updates changed conclusions?

How many reviews were marked as “stable” in 2015?
How many new reviews and updates were published in 2015?

931 new citation versions (447 updates; 484 new)

How many of the 447 updates changed conclusions?

How many reviews were marked as “stable” in 2015?
How many new reviews and updates were published in 2015?

931 new citation versions (447 updates; 484 new)

How many of the 447 updates changed conclusions?

101 (346 = no conclusions changed)

How many reviews were marked as “stable” in 2015?
How many new reviews and updates were published in 2015?

931 new citation versions (447 updates; 484 new)

How many of the 447 updates changed conclusions?

101 (346 = no conclusions changed)

How many reviews were marked as “stable” in 2015?

90
“A search of MEDLINE and PubMed in November 2015 found only **1 RCT study**, and a search by the lead author of [review] yielded **3 potential studies**, but he does not think the inclusion of these new findings could substantially change the conclusions made in **2013**. An update has not been considered necessary for two successive years. Our Trials Search Co-ordinator [Information Specialist] will run a new search in 2016 to re-assess whether an update is needed.”

“This review **is not appropriate for update** since [intervention] is now routinely combined with [intervention] and there have been no further studies using [intervention].”

“This review **will no longer be regularly updated**. Searches will still be undertaken on a two-yearly basis by the [Group]. If, in future, relevant trials are identified, the review will be updated again.”
In first 3 months of 2015, about 40 reviews were withdrawn. How many were withdrawn because authors updating?

In first 3 months of 2015, about 40 reviews were withdrawn. How many were withdrawn because the review was superseded?
In first 3 months of 2015, about 40 reviews were withdrawn. How many were withdrawn because **authors updating**?

2

e.g. “This review is not up to date. It is currently being updated and will be republished when the update is completed.”

In first 3 months of 2015, about 40 reviews were withdrawn. How many were withdrawn because the **review was superseded**?
In first 3 months of 2015, about 40 reviews were withdrawn. How many were withdrawn because **authors updating**?

2

e.g. “This review is not up to date. It is currently being updated and will be republished when the update is completed.”

In first 3 months of 2015, about 40 reviews were withdrawn. How many were withdrawn because the **review was superseded**?

23

e.g. “The review was withdrawn, as of Issue 1, 2015, because it has been superseded by a new Cochrane review: [citation].”
Aims
Aims

• Brief background - Updating Classification System for Cochrane Reviews
• Apply an Update Status to a Cochrane Review using example reviews
• Apply the Update Status to a Cochrane Review in Archie
• Learn how the Update Status will appear alongside a published Cochrane Review
About the Updating Classification System
A little bit of background – and acknowledgements!
La Bibliothèque Cochrane: révolution ou évolution?
Le façonnemenent de l'avenir du contenu Cochrane

The Cochrane Library: révolution or évolution?
Shaping the future of Cochrane content

Background paper for The Cochrane Collaboration's Strategic Session
Paris, France, 18 April 2012

37. Classify Cochrane Reviews of interventions using the classification framework, at least every two years. The framework, to be published on the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, highlights to readers whether a Cochrane Review addresses a historical or current question, and also indicates whether the Cochrane Review is considered up to date, has an update is pending, or is not intended to be updated.
The Updating Classification System and contents of the EPPR guide are based on the decision flowchart to assess systematic reviews for updating included in the following publication:
• **Updating classification system workshop: Vienna Colloquium, 2015:** workshop with a focus on user testing: system, Archie interface, and published review interface

• **Prepare for release and publication:** working with CEU and IKMD teams, and Wiley
Changes to system
Archie interface
Presentation in the CDSR,
Cochrane Library
What is the Updating Classification System?

- Updating Classification System (UCS) guides readers as to whether a Cochrane Review (not protocols) is:
  - up to date
  - likely to be updated in future
  - does not need updating at the current time
- Help Cochrane Review Groups (CRGs) with prioritisation decisions for individual Cochrane Reviews
- Follows a decision-making flowchart
- Available for Intervention and Diagnostic Test Accuracy (DTA) reviews (not protocols)
Let’s look at the system
Decision-making flowchart

**Update status**

Does the published review still address a current question? Has the review had good access or usage? Review used valid methods & was well conducted?

- Yes
- No

Are there any new relevant methods? Are there any new studies, or new information?

- Yes
- No

Will the adoption of new methods change the findings or credibility? Will the new studies/information/data change the findings or credibility?

- Yes or maybe
- No

Rationale for update status

1. Intervention(s) not in [general] use or been superseded
2. Review superseded
3. Research area no longer active
4. Impact of published version (e.g., via article-level metrics)
5. Other (provide reason)

6. No new studies identified with search
7. All studies incorporated from most recent search
8. Potentially relevant studies ongoing but not yet complete
9. Other (provide reason)

10. Certainty (quality) of evidence high in published review
11. New information identified but unlikely to change review findings
12. Other (provide reason)

13. Authors currently updating
14. Studies awaiting assessment
15. New contributors needed
16. Other (provide reason)
• Editor or author knowledge
• Access or usage: article-level metrics (e.g. downloads, Altmetric, guidelines, citations)
- New methods since previous update (e.g. risk of bias, summary of findings table)
- New studies: search for studies (full search or scoping search)
- New info or data (e.g. review authors contacting study authors)
Informal approach (e.g. editor or authors make assessment)
Incorporating sample data
Formal prediction tools
## Sample editable texts for the ‘Explanation’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Update status</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Reviews of interventions</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Reviews of diagnostic test accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| No update planned | 1. Intervention(s) not in [general] use or been superseded | **If Intervention superseded:** The [Intervention] has been replaced by [Newer intervention] and is no longer used [in general]. See [link to another Cochrane Review] for the [Newer intervention].  
**If Intervention withdrawn or no longer available:** The [Intervention] has been withdrawn from the market worldwide because [reason for withdrawal (e.g. causes serious adverse effects)]. | 1. Index test(s) or reference standard not in general use or been superseded | **If test or reference standard superseded:** The [test(s) or reference standard] has been replaced by [insert] and is no longer used [in general]. See [link to another Cochrane Review] for the [Newer test].  
**If test or reference standard withdrawn or no longer available:** The [test(s) or reference standard] has been withdrawn from the market worldwide because [reason for withdrawal (e.g. causes serious adverse effects)]. |
| 2. Review superseded | This Cochrane Review has been superseded because [it has been merged together with another review/split into two or more reviews]. See [insert link to review]. | 2. Review superseded | This Cochrane Review has been superseded because [it has been merged together with another review/split into two or more reviews]. See [insert link to review]. |
| 3. Research area no longer active | [insert reason, such as no new studies expected in this area or ethical reasons]. | 3. Research area no longer active | [Insert reason, such as no new studies expected in this area or ethical reasons]. |
| 4. Impact of published version | [This Cochrane Review has had low usage or impact and is not a priority for updating.] | 4. Impact of published version | [This Cochrane Review has had low usage or impact and is not a priority for updating.] |
| 5. Other | [Insert text] | 5. Other | [Insert text] |
In practice

• Single location to report and share the updating status of a review

• Provides a standard framework for reporting the status (with sample, editable text for the free-text explanations)

• Separates a **publishing activity** (e.g. one that affects citation/DOI/changes content/uses a What’s New event*) with one that **provides a comment or explanation of the updating status** of a review

• Updating status to be published in ‘real time’ alongside the review
Demonstration

- Work through examples
- Assign a status and rationale
- Apply the status and rationale in Archie
Example 1

Oral zinc for arterial and venous leg ulcers

Ewan AJ Wilkinson

First published: 9 September 2014
Assessed as up-to-date: 2 September 2014

Editorial Group: Cochrane Wounds Group
DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD001273.pub3

Cited by: 0 articles
Example 1

Date published: 9 September 2014

Objective: “To determine whether oral zinc sulphate increases the rate of healing of venous or arterial leg ulcers.”

Includes: Six small trials (183 participants) from 1970s


Altmetric (9 Mar 2016) score of 6; and of related articles* 13 (pub Feb 16); 33 (pub Jan 14); 6 (pub Dec 12)

*in same section of Cochrane Lib browse for ‘systemic ulcer therapy’
**Decision-making flowchart**

**Update status**

- Does the published review still address a current question? Has the review had good access or usage? Review used valid methods & was well conducted?
  - No: No update planned
  - Yes

**Rationale for update status**

1. Intervention(s) not in [general] use or been superseded
2. Review superseded
3. Research area no longer active
4. Impact of published version (e.g. via article-level metrics)
5. Other (provide reason)

- Are there any new relevant methods? Are there any new studies, or new information?
  - No: Up to date
  - Yes

- Will the adoption of new methods change the findings or credibility? Will the new studies/information/data change the findings or credibility?
  - No: Up to date
  - Yes or maybe: Update pending

- Prepare update
Example 1: update status

- Update status: No update planned
- Rationale: Research area no longer active
- Explanation: e.g. *No potentially relevant trials have been published since the 1970s.*
Example 2

Silver acetate for smoking cessation

Tim Lancaster, Lindsay F Stead

First published: 12 September 2012
Assessed as up-to-date: 14 August 2012
Editorial Group: Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Group
DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD000191.pub2

Cited by: 2 articles

Go to old article view
Example 2

Date published: 12 September 2012

Objective: “The aim of this review was to determine the effectiveness of silver acetate products (gum, lozenge, spray) in promoting smoking cessation.”

Includes: 3 trials between 1986 and 1996 (search July 2012)

Altmetric (19 Jul 2016) score of 6; and of related articles* 40 (pub Nov 14); 3 (pub Feb 12); 3 (pub Apr 06); 26 (Mar 16)

*in same section of Cochrane Lib browse for ‘pharmacological interventions’
Example 2

Authors’ conclusions – Implications for research: “Further research on silver acetate for smoking cessation is unlikely to be helpful.”

New search (March 2016): identified no new trials
Example 2: update status

- **Update status:** No update planned
- **Rationale:** Research area no longer active or intervention not in [general] use or been superseded
- **Explanation:** e.g. *No new trials since 1996, and further research on silver acetate for smoking cessation is unlikely to be helpful.*
Example 3

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

**Allergen-specific oral immunotherapy for peanut allergy**

Ulugbek Nurmatov, Iris Venderbosch, Graham Devereux, F Estelle R Simons, Aziz Sheikh

First published: 12 September 2012
Assessed as up-to-date: 13 April 2012

Editorial Group: Cochrane Tobacco Addiction Group

DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD009014.pub2

Cited by: 9 articles

[View/save citation][Refresh][Citing literature]
Example 3

Date published: 12 September 2012

Objective: “To establish the effectiveness and safety of oral immunotherapy (OIT) in people with IgE-mediated peanut allergy who develop symptoms after peanut ingestion.”

Includes: 1 trial (28 participants) from 2011; 8 ongoing studies

New scoping search (Jul 2016): identified some potentially relevant trials

Altmetric (19 Jul 2016) score of 31; cited by 19 PubMedCentral articles
Decision-making flowchart

**Update status**

- Does the published review still address a current question? Has the review had good access or usage? Review used valid methods & was well conducted?
  - Yes
  - No
    - No update planned

**Rationale for update status**

- 1. Intervention(s) not in [general] use or been superseded
- 2. Review superseded
- 3. Research area no longer active
- 4. Impact of published version (e.g. via article-level metrics)
- 5. Other (provide reason)

- 6. No new studies identified with search
- 7. All studies incorporated from most recent search
- 8. Potentially relevant studies ongoing but not yet complete
- 9. Other (provide reason)

- 10. Certainty (quality) of evidence high in published review
- 11. New information identified but unlikely to change review findings
- 12. Other (provide reason)

- 13. Authors currently updating
- 14. Studies awaiting assessment
- 15. New contributors needed
- 16. Other (provide reason)

**Update pending**

- Yes or maybe

**Prepare update**
Example 3: update status

- **Update status:** Update pending
- **Rationale:** Studies awaiting assessment
- **Explanation:** *e.g. A search for studies has identified potentially relevant studies (see ‘Characteristics of studies awaiting classification’). These studies have not yet been incorporated into this Cochrane Review.*
Archie
UCS in Archie

- Classify reviews within Archie
- Run reports in Archie
- Key difference with this system to all our publishing systems, is that the update statuses will be published as and when selected (and can be added or revised between review versions)
- *Demonstrated wireframes in Vienna (Oct 2015); adjusted Archie interfaces based on feedback*
A001 Acellular vaccines for preventing whooping cough in children - Google Chrome

https://test-archie.cochrane.org/sections/documents/documentProperties.jsp?key=16639908

Updating classification: From the editorial team

Update status: Up to date

Rationale: Certainty of evidence high in published version

Explanation (published):
There is high-quality evidence that [Intervention] is not effective/is effective meaning further research is unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect.

Insert Date of Search ▼ Save and Publish

Notes (internal):

History:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Revised</th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Version No</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Revised By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>07/01/2016</td>
<td>CD001478.pub6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>No update planed</td>
<td>Review superseded</td>
<td>MacLehose, Harrington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/11/2015</td>
<td>CD001478.pub6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>No update planed</td>
<td>Intervention not in general</td>
<td>Ahrtschi, Olga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16/11/2015</td>
<td>CD001478.pub6</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>No update planed</td>
<td>Intervention not in general</td>
<td>Ahrtschi, Olga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cochrane

Updating tab

Explanation box:

- fill in the text box with appropriate messaging
- remove any unwanted brackets or ellipses e.g. [...]  
- be specific about time periods e.g. update due in ‘October’ 2017 rather than ‘autumn’ 2017
Applying your status in Archie

- Using the results from the scenarios
- Apply the Updating status and Rationale in Archie
- *Note: status to be applied to all existing intervention and DTA reviews, as well as new reviews and updates*
Example 1

*Oral zinc for arterial and venous leg ulcers*

**Date published:** 9 September 2014  
**Altmetric (09 Mar 2016):** 6  
**Altmetric of related articles (in same section of Cochrane Lib browse for ‘systemic ulcer therapy’):**  
13 (pub Feb 16); 33 (pub Jan 14); 6 (pub Dec 12)

- **Update status:** No update planned  
- **Rationale:** Research area no longer active
Update status: No update planned
Rationale: Research area no longer active

Explanation (published):
full searches have been conducted for this review in 2014/2012/2010/2008/2007/2005 - no new studies identified at any of these time points - no update planned

Notes (internal):
The latest Updating status decision was made by the Editorial board.

History:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date Revised</th>
<th>DOI</th>
<th>Version No</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Revised By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14/03/2016</td>
<td>CD001273.pub3</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>No update planned</td>
<td>Research area no longer active</td>
<td>Mehta, Monaz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
test-archie.cochrane.org says:

This update status, rationale and explanation will be published live next to the Cochrane Review in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Are you sure you want to continue?

OK  Cancel

Explanation:
[Insert reason, such as no new studies expected in this area or ethical reasons].

Insert  Date of Search  ▼

Save and Publish

Notes (internal):
This is a test scenario.
## Updating Status Report: Any Status

Acute Respiratory Infections Group, 11/03/2016 08:57

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Review No</th>
<th>Review Type</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Update Status</th>
<th>Rationale</th>
<th>Date Revised</th>
<th>Revised By</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acellular vaccines for preventing whooping cough in children</td>
<td>A001</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>No update planned</td>
<td>Review superseded</td>
<td>08/01/2016 04:34</td>
<td>MacLehose, Harriet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetaminophen (paracetamol) for the common cold in adults</td>
<td>A145</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>No update planned</td>
<td>Intervention not in general use or been superseded</td>
<td>11/12/2015 08:39</td>
<td>Mehta, Monaz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acetylcysteine and carbocysteine for acute upper and lower respiratory tract infections in paediatric patients without chronic broncho-pulmonary disease</td>
<td>A002</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>No update planned</td>
<td>Intervention not in general use or been superseded</td>
<td>12/01/2016 14:30</td>
<td>Anthirsch, Olga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acupuncture for mumps in children</td>
<td>A147</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>No new studies identified with search</td>
<td>10/13/2015 04:40</td>
<td>Moustgaard, Rasmus K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acyclovir for treating varicella in otherwise healthy children and adolescents</td>
<td>A003</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>No new studies identified with search</td>
<td>18/12/2015 03:22</td>
<td>Ria, Jr, Jacob</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advising patients to increase fluid intake for treating acute respiratory infections</td>
<td>A093</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>No new studies identified with search</td>
<td>08/01/2016 13:57</td>
<td>Anthirsch, Olga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantadine and rimantadine for influenza A in adults</td>
<td>A006</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>No update planned</td>
<td>Intervention not in general use or been superseded</td>
<td>19/11/2015 00:44</td>
<td>Anthirsch, Olga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amantadine and rimantadine for influenza A in children and the elderly</td>
<td>A005</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>No new studies identified with search</td>
<td>09/01/2016 01:11</td>
<td>Anthirsch, Olga</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antibiotic prophylaxis for preventing meningitis in patients with basilar skull fractures</td>
<td>A101</td>
<td>Intervention review</td>
<td>Active</td>
<td>Up to date</td>
<td>No new studies identified with search</td>
<td>12/01/2016 14:24</td>
<td>Anthirsch, Olga</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cochrane Reviews and the Cochrane Library
• System will help readers of Cochrane Reviews, to guide them about the updating status of the Cochrane Review, and to help them decide how to use a Cochrane Review

• Display the Update Status in the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews, the Cochrane Library, both with the individual Cochrane Review and as tags to help with browsing
Self-monitoring of blood glucose in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus who are not using insulin

Up to date

First published: 13 January 2012  Full publication history
Editorial Group: Cochrane Metabolic and Endocrine Disorders Group
DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005060.pub3
Cited by: 14 articles  Refresh Citing literature

Abstract

Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) has been found to be effective for patients with type 1
Example: Up to date

Cochrane

Information

DOI
10.1002/14651858.CD005060.pub3
Copyright © 2012 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
Request Permissions
Publication History
Article first published online: 18 January 2012
Up to date
Potentially relevant studies ongoing but not yet complete.
A search for studies has identified one ongoing study (see Characteristics of studies awaiting assessment).
Assessed: 1 January 2016

Find Related Content

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)
Blood Glucose

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Self-monitoring of blood glucose in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus who are not using insulin

L Malanda, Laura MC Welsing, Ingrid I Riphagen, Jacqueline M Dekker, Giel Nijpels, Sandra DM Bot

Published: 18 January 2012
Full publication history

Trial Group: Cochrane Metabolic and Endocrine Disorders Group
DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005060.pub3
Cited by: 14 articles

Abstract

Background

Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) has been found to be effective for patients with type 1
Example: No update planned

**Abstract**

**Background**

Self-monitoring of blood glucose (SMBG) has been found to be effective for patients with type 1
Example: Update pending
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Refine your results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Published or updated within the last:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ All dates (xxx)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 3 months (74)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 6 months (65)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 1 year (6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>○ 2 years (26)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Cochrane Review Group**
- Acute Respiratory Infections Group (5)
- Childhood Cancer Group (5)
- Epilepsy Group (5)
- Eyes and Vision Group (5)
- Metabolic and Endocrine Disorders Group (5)
- Methodology Review Group (5)
- Movement Disorders Group (5)

**Stage**
- Review (65)
- Protocol (6)

**Type**
- Overview (10)
- Diagnostic (6)
- Methodology (5)
- Prognosis (1)

**Status**
- Update (74)
- New Search (65)
- Major Change (26)
- Conclusions Changed (6)

**Updates**
- Up to date (65)
- Update pending (6)
- No update planned (24)

---

**Dietary sodium manipulation and asthma**
Emily J Bailey, Christopher J Cates, Sue G Kruske, Peter S Morris, Nglaire Brown and Anne B Chang
- Up to date | Online Publication Date: 23 April 2015
- Conclusion changed | Review

**Culture-specific programs for children and adults from who have asthma**
Emily J Bailey, Christopher J Cates, Sue G Kruske, Peter S Morris and Nglaire Brown
- Up to date | Online Publication Date: 23 January 2015
- Diagnostic | Review

**Dietary sodium manipulation and asthma**
Annie B Chang, Brett Taylor, I Brent Masters, Yancy Laifoo and Alexander DH Brown
- Update pending | Online Publication Date: 12 December 2014
- Diagnostic | Review

**Dietary sodium manipulation and asthma**
Zara Pogson and Tricia Mckeever
- Up to date | Online Publication Date: 23 January 2014
- Methodology | Review

**Culture-specific programs for children and adults from minority whos have asthma**
Emily J Bailey, Christopher J Cates, Sue G Kruske, Peter S Morris, Nglaire Brown and Anne B Chang
- No update planned | Online Publication Date: 25 May 2013
- Overview | Protocol

**Indigenous healthcare worker involvement for Indigenous adults and children**
Anne B Chang, Brett Taylor, I Brent Masters, Yancy Laifoo and Alexander DH Brown
- Online Publication Date: 23 January 2012
- Overview | Review

**Dietary sodium manipulation and asthma**
Zara Pogson and Tricia Mckeever
- Up to date | Online Publication Date: 23 June 2011
- Diagnostic | Review

**Indigenous healthcare worker involvement for Indigenous adults and children**
Anne B Chang, Brett Taylor, I Brent Masters, Yancy Laifoo and Alexander DH Brown
- Up to date | Online Publication Date: 23 June 2011
- Diagnostic | Protocol
Browse page
Showing Update Classifications identifiers (details)

Culture-specific programs for children and adults from who have asthma
Emily J Bailey, Christopher J Cates, Sue G Kruske, Peter S Morris and Ngiare Brown
✔ Up to date | Online Publication Date: 23 January 2015

Dietary sodiumnipulation and asthma
Anne B Chang, Brett Taylor, I Brent Masters, Yancy Laifoo and Alexander DH Brown
⚠ Update pending | Online Publication Date: 12 December 2014

Culture-specific programs for children and adults from minority s who have asthma
Emily J Bailey, Christopher J Cates, Sue G Kruske, Peter S Morris, Ngiare Brown and Anne B Chang
🏥 No update planned: For reference | Online Publication Date: 23 May 2013

Overview | Protocol
Recap and what’s next
Review of the webinar aims

• Learn about the Updating Classification System for Cochrane Reviews
• Apply an Update Status to a Cochrane Review using example reviews
• Apply an Update Status to a Cochrane Review in Archie
• Learn how the Update Status will appear alongside a published Cochrane Review
What’s next?

- Now available in Live Archie
- Guidance to use the UCS, is available on the Editorial and Publishing Policy Resource website
- Workshop at Colloquium
- Develop updating strategy and identify areas for future work
Thank you