CAN I BEAT PUBMED’s FILTERS AT THEIR OWN GAME?
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I’m a Reference Librarian at an institution with a large nursing program. Nursing undergraduates often ask me to filter the literature databases for articles that are both authored by a nurse, and clearly research-based in nature. I had been using PubMed’s Filters feature, but decided to see if I could write a Boolean search clause that would do a better, more consistent job.

Each of the following clauses:

A) “Substance-Related Disorders/prevention and control”[MeSH]
B) “kangaroo care”
C) “Obesity”[MeSH] AND “Diabetes Mellitus, Type 2”[MeSH]

1) Was searched under the PubMed Filters “Clinical Trial”; “Meta-analysis”; “Practice Guideline”; “Randomized Controlled Trial”, “Review”, and “Nursing Journals”

2) And then linked with a Boolean AND to the phrase: (randomi* OR cohort OR systematic OR RCT) AND (nurs* OR LVN OR LPN OR RN OR BSN OR MSN OR ND OR DNSc)

COMPARISON: I obtained all six sets of articles and subjected them to a pre-determined test as to whether they qualified as “nurse-authored research articles”. For an article to qualify, it had to have at least one author with an identifiably nursing-related degree or job title; and it had to follow a standard Introduction/Review/Methods/Results/Conclusion research structure. I then determine what percentage of each of the six groups qualified.

RESULTS

Combination A2 (my filter) beat A1(control) by 52%[12/23] to 17%[17/99]
Combination B2 beat the control by 81%[9/11] to 56%[9/16]
Combination C2 beat combination C1 by 36%[4/11] to 18%[7/39].
All three differences are statistically significant based on a Chi-square test assuming one degree of freedom. There is a no greater than 1% chance that the differences are due to chance alone.

SO WHAT? I’ve used this new filter at the Reference Desk. Should PubMed adopt something like this as an option?