The examples we've seen on the slides so far have been of psycINFO and then of psycINFO, Embase and MEDLINE and they are all available through the Ovid interface and they are strongly clinical but you may remember from earlier that I mentioned if the subject you are interested in, if your question, involves a population, or set of professionals, who are not clinically based, not just found in a clinical environment but have a community base as well, then you may want to look through the contents of journals which are relevant to those fields as well. Some of the databases that might be useful for that are listed in this slide in bold. So, ASSIA, Sociological Abstracts, which includes Social Services Abstracts, ERIC which covers education and teaching but which is very good if you've got anything to do with training but is also strong on the wellbeing of the child.

Also mentioned here is ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global which is, as it sounds, what you could use if you've decided you want to include theses in your review process. You will find out about the existence of theses by using the subject specific databases because they index relevant theses, they tell you about the existence of theses that have been awarded in their subject areas but ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global is the product to use to look across all subject areas. So you may want to include that, or you may not, it depends if you've decided you are definitely going to exclude theses anyway from your review process, then you wouldn't need to add it, obviously.

These three or four products are all searchable on the same interface, but not Ovid. Just as you can search more than one product on Ovid, you can search these four together and you would do that through the ProQuest interface because that's where we've bought access to these.

To get to any one of them you would go to the “Databases by subject” webpage again, you can pick “Clinical psychology” and you will see, for the first screenshot here the example is ASSIA and that’s at the top of the clinical psychology databases list [because it begins with “A”]. If you click on its title that will take you into this ProQuest interface and you will be searching ASSIA, which is the Applied Social Sciences Index & Abstracts.

When you know you can something on one interface, you can often do the same thing on another. They have the same functions and features, they just might be labelled slightly differently, or be in different places.

However, one of the main differences for the ProQuest interface is that you will come into the “Basic Search” option and by default, ProQuest goes away and searches the full-text where it can.

It owns quite a lot of full-text, so even if you’re in a product which is an abstracting and indexing database, so one which we don’t buy for full-text access but so that people can find out about what exists, even when you search one of those, like
ASSIA, the search will still be of a whole article or a whole thesis, if ProQuest is able to do that.

That’s not the same as you would be doing in the other abstracting and indexing databases and it is usually also too much. You don’t necessarily want your concepts separated by pages (page 20 and page 86 of a thesis, one of your concepts appears and then other) because this doesn’t link them very strongly which is why an abstracting and indexing search is usually a good thing. You are finding about the existence of articles for which your topics, your concepts, are strongly part of the content.

To replicate that kind of search in ProQuest, you would go to the “Advanced Search” option which is one of the orange circles on the screenshot.

You get three search boxes (to which you can add) and off to the right are what you can tell it to search within and it will be anywhere by default but if you drop that menu down, were the orange arrow is on the screenshot, you will be able to pick “Anywhere except full-text (NOFT)” and I think that would be the best choice for your systematic review searching. If you are looking at databases through the ProQuest interface, my advice would be to go to the “Advanced Search” option, to choose “Anywhere except full-text” against the search boxes and to therefore do a similar kind of search, looking in the abstract, title and keywords, compared to looking through the whole document where that exists.

The other difference in ProQuest is that it has a Search History section, you can do that kind of search, thinking concept by concept and putting them together in ways that make best sense for the kind of search that you’re after but instead of being labelled Search History, the label in ProQuest is “Recent searches”. If you select that [Recent searches] it will take you into the search history.

The other thing which is highlighted on this slide, is the Thesaurus.

In Ovid you can choose to “Map term to subject heading” underneath the search box, there is the tick beside that, or you can take the tick off, and that’s how you would search a subject heading thesaurus. To do this in the ProQuest interface, you would go into the Thesaurus section [which is what the black arrow coming in from the right is pointing at on the slide] and that would let you search the thesaurus for the different databases you have selected.

There is another slide for ProQuest coming up, but the take home message is that you can do the same things on different interfaces, it’s just where they are may be different, the labels may be different and there may be differences in the operators. Operators AND and OR are the same everywhere but there may be other slight differences in ways of combining search terms if they are useful.

If you are not sure, there is always the Help feature, so the question mark here or the label “Help” in another interface perhaps and have a wee look to see if it helps you work out how to do what you want.