

Letter

Review of Online Evidence-based Practice Point-of-Care Information Summary Providers: Authors' Reply to the Response by the Publisher of DynaMed

Rita Banzi¹; Alessandro Liberati^{1,2}; Ivan Moschetti¹; Ludovica Tagliabue^{1,3}; Lorenzo Moja¹

¹Italian Cochrane Centre, Mario Negri Institute for Pharmacological Research, Milan, Italy

²University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy

³University of Milan, Milan, Italy

Corresponding Author:

Rita Banzi

Italian Cochrane Centre Mario Negri Institute

Via La Masa 19

Milan, 20159

Italy

Phone: 39 0239014671

Fax: 39 023559048

Email: banzi@marionegri.it

Related Article:

Comment on: Alper BS. Review of Online Evidence-based Practice Point-of-Care Information Summary Providers: Response by the Publisher of DynaMed. *J Med Internet Res*. 2010 Sep 09;12(3) p. e39 <http://www.jmir.org/2010/3/e39/>

Abstract

We are pleased that the publisher of DynaMed clarified his evidence-based methodology in response to our review. We stress again how good reporting is a prerequisite for transparency. This lesson comes from the reporting of research findings but its extension to the development of information sources should be considered.

(*J Med Internet Res* 2010;12(3):e40) doi: [10.2196/jmir.1626](https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1626)

We thank Dr. Alper for his comment in response to our review [1], which gives us the opportunity to stress again how essential good reporting is for transparency. This lesson comes from the reporting of research findings, but its extension to the development of information sources should be considered.

Methodologic quality is closely intertwined with the quality of reporting [2]. Lack of details on how research (or in this case: editorial processes) is conducted leads users to assume that the quality was inadequate, unless information to the contrary is provided (the “guilty until proven innocent” approach) [3]. This is often justified because faulty reporting generally reflects faulty methods [4, 5].

We appreciate that the editor of DynaMed (which is a “blockbuster” in the point-of-care information service market) shows the willingness to improve the explicitness and transparency of their methodology. A clear reference on the freely accessible website pages helps users and purchasers to better understand the value of the product.

It is reassuring when well-known and leading publishers do not take for granted their value. Reputation itself is no guarantee for quality. We hope that other publishers will be equally transparent and responsive to criticism.

Conflicts of Interest

None declared

References

1. Banzi R, Liberati A, Moschetti I, Tagliabue L, Moja L. A review of online evidence-based practice point-of-care information summary providers. *J Med Internet Res* 2010;12(3):e26 [FREE Full text] [doi: [10.2196/jmir.1288](https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1288)] [Medline: [20610379](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20610379/)]
2. Huwiler-Müntener K, Jüni P, Junker C, Egger M. Quality of reporting of randomized trials as a measure of methodologic quality. *JAMA* 2002 Jun 5;287(21):2801-2804 [FREE Full text] [Medline: [12038917](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12038917/)]

3. Jüni P, Altman DG, Egger M. Systematic reviews in health care: Assessing the quality of controlled clinical trials. *BMJ* 2001 Jul 7;323(7303):42-46 [[FREE Full text](#)] [Medline: [11440947](#)]
4. Liberati A, Himel HN, Chalmers TC. A quality assessment of randomized control trials of primary treatment of breast cancer. *J Clin Oncol* 1986 Jun;4(6):942-951. [Medline: [3711962](#)]
5. Schulz KF, Chalmers I, Hayes RJ, Altman DG. Empirical evidence of bias. Dimensions of methodological quality associated with estimates of treatment effects in controlled trials. *JAMA* 1995 Feb 1;273(5):408-412. [Medline: [7823387](#)]

Edited by G Eysenbach; this is a non-peer-reviewed article. Submitted 02.08.10; accepted 08.08.10; published 09.09.10.

Please cite as:

Banzi R, Liberati A, Moschetti I, Tagliabue L, Moja L

Review of Online Evidence-based Practice Point-of-Care Information Summary Providers: Authors' Reply to the Response by the Publisher of DynaMed

J Med Internet Res 2010;12(3):e40

URL: <http://www.jmir.org/2010/3/e40/>

doi: [10.2196/jmir.1626](https://doi.org/10.2196/jmir.1626)

PMID: [20829184](https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/20829184/)

©Rita Banzi, Alessandro Liberati, Ivan Moschetti, Ludovica Tagliabue, Lorenzo Moja. Originally published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research (<http://www.jmir.org>), 09.09.2010 This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/2.0/>), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work, first published in the Journal of Medical Internet Research, is properly cited. The complete bibliographic information, a link to the original publication on <http://www.jmir.org/>, as well as this copyright and license information must be included.