

Research questions posed in systematic reviews of theory and methods in the domain of climate change studies

Describing use of results

- What are the expected uses of findings arising from a given method? [47]
- How is the use of findings arising from a given method addressed by the literature? [47]
- What research applications are addressed using data arising from study of a given construct? [37]

Describing methods used

- What methods are used for study? [37]
- What are the indicators used to study a given topic? [18]
- What tools are used to research a given complex construct? [2]
- What general approaches are used in research on a given topic? [46]
- What specific methods are used in research on a given topic? [46]

Assessing methods used

- Are the tools used to research a given complex construct socially adequate? [2]
- Are the tools used to research a given complex construct ecologically adequate? [2]
- How do indicators used to study a given topic fit into existing frameworks for the study of that topic? [18]
- To what extent are the tools used to research a given complex construct consistent with the principles of a specified theory? [2]

Describing links between theory and practice

- How could the set of principles found in the literature relevant to a desirable practice be improved? [42]
- How useful are definitions of a given construct to a given application? [17]
- What insights does a given literature have for problems related to a specific complex construct? [43]

Describing theory

- What are the key features of the literature on principles for a specific desirable practice? [42]
- How is a given construct defined in the literature? [17]
- What is the most suitable term for denoting a specific complex construct? [45]

- How does a given literature consider a specific complex construct? [49]

Describing coverage

- What is the coverage of research on a given topic? [18]
- What are the gaps in research on a given topic? [18]
- Which principles relevant to a desirable practice are not sufficiently covered in the literature? [48]

References

1. Espeland WN, Stevens ML. Commensuration as a social process. *Annu Rev Sociol.* 1998;24: 313–343. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.24.1.313.
2. Plummer R, de Loe R, Armitage D. A Systematic Review of Water Vulnerability Assessment Tools. *Water Resour Manag.* 2012;26: 4327–4346. doi:10.1007/s11269-012-0147-5.
3. Delaney A, Chesterman S, Crane TA, Tamás PA, Ericksen P. A systematic review of local vulnerability to climate change: In search of transparency, coherence and compatability. *CCAFS Work Pap.* 2014;97. Available: <http://hdl.handle.net/10568/56692>.
4. Dixon-Woods M, Cavers D, Agarwal S, Annandale E, Arthur A, Harvey J, et al. Conducting a critical interpretive synthesis of the literature on access to healthcare by vulnerable groups. *BMC Med Res Methodol.* 2006;6: 35. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-6-35.
5. Lakerveld RP, Lele S, Crane TA, Fortuin KPJ, Springate-Baginski O. The social distribution of provisioning forest ecosystem services: Evidence and insights from Odisha, India. *Ecosyst Serv.* 2015;14: 56–66. doi:doi:10.1016/j.ecoser.2015.04.001.
6. Pronk M, Maat H, Crane TA. Vulnerability Assessments as a Political Creation: Tsunami Management in Portugal. *Disasters.* Submitted.
7. Weiler V, Udo HMJ, Viets T, Crane TA, De Boer IJM. Handling multi-functionality of livestock in a life cycle assessment: the case of smallholder dairying in Kenya. *Curr Opin Environ Sustain.* 2014;8: 29–38. doi:10.1016/j.cosust.2014.07.009.
8. Beauchamp A, Backholer K, Magliano D, Peeters A. The effect of obesity prevention interventions according to socioeconomic position: a systematic review. *Obes Rev.* 2014;15: 541–554. doi:10.1111/obr.12161.
9. Edwards PN. “A vast machine”: Standards as social technology. *Science.* 2004;304: 827–828. doi:10.1126/science.1099290.
10. Lepori B, Bonaccorsi A. The socio-political construction of a European census of higher education institutions: design, methodology and comparability issues. *Minerva.* 2013;51: 271–293. doi:10.1007/s11024-013-9235-9.
11. Lovell H. Climate change, markets and standards: the case of financial accounting. *Econ Soc.* 2014;43: 260–284. doi:10.1080/03085147.2013.812830.
12. Ascui F, Lovell H. As frames collide: making sense of carbon accounting. *Account Audit Account J.* 2011;24: 978–999. doi:10.1108/09513571111184724.

13. Timmermans S, Epstein S. A World of Standards but not a Standard World: Toward a Sociology of Standards and Standardization*. *Annu Rev Sociol.* 2010;36: 69–89. doi:10.1146/annurev.soc.012809.102629.
14. Merry SE, Coutin SB. Technologies of truth in the anthropology of conflict: AES/APLA Presidential Address, 2013. *Am Ethnol.* 2014;41: 1–16. doi:10.1111/amet.12055.
15. Alastalo M, Pösö T. Number of Children Placed Outside the Home as an Indicator - Social and Moral Implications of Commensuration. *Soc Policy Adm.* 2014;48: 721–738. doi:10.1111/spol.12073.
16. Brunsson N, Rasche A, Seidl D. The Dynamics of Standardization: Three Perspectives on Standards in Organization Studies. *Organ Stud.* 2012;33: 613–632. doi:10.1177/0170840612450120.
17. Castleden M, McKee M, Murray V, Leonardi G. Resilience thinking in health protection. *J Public Health.* 2011; 369–377. doi:10.1093/pubmed/fdr027.
18. Liqueste C, Piroddi C, Drakou EG, Gurney L, Katsanevakis S, Charef A, et al. Current Status and Future Prospects for the Assessment of Marine and Coastal Ecosystem Services: A Systematic Review. *PLoS ONE.* 2013;8: e67737. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0067737.
19. Magarey JM. Elements of a systematic review. *Int J Nurs Pract.* 2001;7: 376–382. doi:10.1046/j.1440-172X.2001.00295.x.
20. Thomas, James, and Angela Harden. Methods for the Thematic Synthesis of Qualitative Research in Systematic Reviews. *BMC Medical Research Methodology.* 2008;8 (1): 45. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-8-45.
21. Dixon-Woods, Mary, Sheila Bonas, Andrew Booth, David R. Jones, Tina Miller, Alex J. Sutton, Rachel L. Shaw, Jonathan A. Smith, and Bridget Young. How Can Systematic Reviews Incorporate Qualitative Research? A Critical Perspective. *Qualitative Research.* 2006;6 (1): 27–44. doi:10.1177/1468794106058867.
22. Bing-Jonsson, Pia Cecilie, Ida Torunn Bjørk, Dag Hofoss, Marit Kirkevold, and Christina Foss. Instruments Measuring Nursing Staff Competence in Community Health Care: A Systematic Literature Review. *Home Health Care Management and Practice.* 2013;25 (6): 282–94. doi:10.1177/1084822313494784.
23. Dubois, Carl-Ardy, Danielle D'Amour, Marie-Pascale Pomey, Francine Girard, and Isabelle Brault. Conceptualizing Performance of Nursing Care as a Prerequisite for Better Measurement: A Systematic and Interpretive Review. *BMC Nursing.* 2013;12: 7. doi:10.1186/1472-6955-12-7.
24. Le Reste, Jean Yves, Patrice Nabbe, Benedicte Manceau, Charilaos Lygidakis, Christa Doerr, Heidrun Lingner, Slawomir Czachowski, et al. The European General Practice Research Network Presents a Comprehensive Definition of Multimorbidity in Family Medicine and Long Term Care, Following a Systematic Review of Relevant Literature. *Journal of American Medical Directors Association.* 2013;14: 319–25. doi:10.1016/j.jamda.2013.01.001.
25. van der Lee, Johanna, Lidwine Mokkink, Martha Grootenhuis, Hugo Heymans, and Martin Offringa. Definitions and Measurement of Chronic Health Conditions in Childhood: A Systematic Review. *JAMA?: The Journal of the American Medical Association.* 2007;297 (24): 2741–51.

26. Wells, Kathleen, and Julia H. Littell. Study Quality Assessment in Systematic Reviews of Research on Intervention Effects. *Research on Social Work Practice*. 2009;19 (1): 52–62. doi:10.1177/1049731508317278.
27. Carroll C, Booth A, Leaviss J, Rick J. Best fit? framework synthesis: refining the method. *BMC Med Res Methodol*. 2013;13: 37. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-13-37.
28. Morse JM. Constructing Qualitatively Derived Theory: Concept Construction and Concept Typologies. *Qual Health Res*. 2004;14: 1387–1395. doi:10.1177/1049732304269676
29. Borgatti SP. Cultural Domain Analysis. *J Quant Anthropol*. 1994;4: 261–278.
30. Glaser BG. The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis. *Soc Probl*. 1965;12: 436–445.
31. Noblit GW, Hare RD. *Meta-ethnography: Synthesizing qualitative studies*. Newbury Park, California: Sage; 1988.
32. Kampen JK, Tamás PA. Should I take this seriously? A simple checklist for calling bullshit on policy supporting research. *Qual Quant*. 2014;48: 1213–1223. doi:DOI 10.1007/s11135-013-9830-8.
33. da Silva S, Tamás PA, Kampen JK. Is research on Latin American social movements interpretable? Using systematic review to test for transparency and structure prior to quality assessment. *Lat Am Res Rev*. Forthcoming;
34. Jensen, Mads Dagnis, and Peter Marcus Kristensen. ?The Elephant in the Room: Mapping the Latent Communication Pattern in European Union Studies. *Journal of European Public Policy*. 2013;20 (1): 1–20. doi:10.1080/13501763.2012.699656.
35. Baca M, L derach P, Haggar J, Schroth G, Ovalle O. An Integrated Framework for Assessing Vulnerability to Climate Change and Developing Adaptation Strategies for Coffee Growing Families in Mesoamerica. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9: e88463. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0088463.
36. Hahn MB, Riederer A, Foster S. The Livelihood Vulnerability Index: A pragmatic approach to assessing risks from climate variability and change? A case study in Mozambique. *Glob Environ Change*. 2009;19: 74–88. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.11.002.
37. Driscoll DA, Banks SC, Barton PS, Ikin K, Lentini P, Lindenmayer DB, et al. The Trajectory of Dispersal Research in Conservation Biology. *Systematic Review*. *PLoS ONE*. 2014;9: e95053. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0095053.
38. Ford J, Smit B. A Framework for Assessing the Vulnerability of Communities in the Canadian Arctic to Risks Associated with Climate Change. *Arctic*. 2004;57: 389– 400. doi:10.14430/arctic516.
39. Dubois C-A, Amour D D', Pomey M-P, Girard F, Brault I. Conceptualizing performance of nursing care as a prerequisite for better measurement: a systematic and interpretive review. *BMC Nurs*. 2013;12: 7. doi:10.1186/1472-6955-12-7.
40. Delaney A, Tamás PA, Tobi H. Which standards from which disciplines? A test of Systematic Review for designing quality interdisciplinary evaluations. *J Dev Eff*. Forthcoming;

41. Campbell R, Pound P, Pope C, Britten N, Pill R, Morgan M, et al. Evaluating meta-ethnography: a synthesis of qualitative research on lay experiences of diabetes and diabetes care. *Soc Sci Med.* 2003;56: 671–684. doi:10.1016/S0277-9536(02)00064-3.
42. Carroll C, Booth A, Lloyd-Jones M. Should We Exclude Inadequately Reported Studies From Qualitative Systematic Reviews? An Evaluation of Sensitivity Analyses in Two Case Study Reviews. *Qual Health Res.* 2012;22: 1425–1434. doi:10.1177/1049732312452937.
43. Edwards AG, Russell IT, Stott NC. Signal versus noise in the evidence base for medicine: an alternative to hierarchies of evidence? *Fam Pract.* 1998;15: 319–322.
44. Lemmer B, Grellier R, Steven J. Systematic Review of Nonrandom and Qualitative Research Literature: Exploring and Uncovering an Evidence Base for Health Visiting and Decision Making. *Qual Health Res.* 1999;9: 315–328. doi:10.1177/104973299129121884.
45. Hallfors MH, Vaara EM, Hyvarinen M, Oksanen M, Schulman LE, Siipi H, et al. Coming to Terms with the Concept of Moving Species Threatened by Climate Change - A Systematic Review of the Terminology and Definitions. *PLoS ONE.* 2014;9: e102979. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0102979.
46. Schultz CA. The U.S. Forest Service's analysis of cumulative effects to wildlife: A study of legal standards, current practice, and ongoing challenges on a National Forest. *Environ Impact Assess Rev.* 2012;32: 74–81. doi:10.1016/J.EIAR.2011.03.003.
47. Laurans Y, Rankovic A, Bille R, Pirard R, Mermet L. Use of ecosystem services economic valuation for decision making: Questioning a literature blindspot. *J Environ Manage.* 2013;119: 208–219. doi:10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.01.008.
48. Luederitz C, Lang DJ, Wehrden H Von. A systematic review of guiding principles for sustainable urban neighborhood development. *Landsc Urban Plan.* 2013;118: 40–52. doi:10.1016/j.landurbplan.2013.06.002.
49. Plummer R, Armitage DR, de Loe RC. Adaptive Comanagement and Its Relationship to Environmental Governance. *Ecol Soc.* 2013;18: 21. doi:10.5751/ES-05383-180121.