Trends analysis of cancer topic of Cochrane systematic reviews: a bibliometric analysis

Kelu Yang

Evidence-Based Nursing Center, School of Nursing, Lanzhou University

Ya Gao

Evidence-Based Medicine Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Lanzhou University

Yitong Cai

Evidence-Based Nursing Center, School of Nursing, Lanzhou University

Ming Liu

Evidence-Based Medicine Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Lanzhou University

Cuncun Lu

Evidence-Based Medicine Center, School of Basic Medical Sciences, Lanzhou University

Junhua Zhang

Evidence-Based Medicine Center, Tianjin University of Traditional Chinese Medicine

Jinhui Tian (✉ tianjh@lzu.edu.cn)

Lanzhou University of School of nursing <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0054-2454>

Research article

Keywords: Cancer, bibliometric analysis, Cochrane systematic reviews, Citespace

Posted Date: August 2nd, 2019

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.2.12336/v1>

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Abstract

Purpose: To comprehensively analyze the scientific outputs of cancer topic of Cochrane systematic reviews (Cancer-CSR). **Patients and methods:** Cochrane Database of Systematic Review and Web of Science Core Collection were retrieved limited from Jan. 1, 2009 to Dec. 12, 2018. CiteSpace IV and Excel 2018 were applied to analyze and visualize the literature information. **Results:** Ultimately, 607 Cancer-CSR were retrieved, 32 countries, 179 institutions and 260 authors involved. The number of publications in Cancer-CSR has been increasing over the past decades (25(2009)-77(2018)). UK, USA, Canada, Australia, and Germany worked closely with other countries, especially UK (n=361) has taken the lead in this field. The top 10 contributive institutions, which were almost came from developed countries, collaborated closely with other institutions. Cochrane Database Syst Rev, C Hdb Sys and J Clin Oncol were the top three journal/book with the highest co-citation. The top three co-cited references were the two different version of Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews and the guidelines of Review Manager. The biggest cluster of keywords “cytoreductive surgery (CRS)” and the latest clusters “visual inspection” and “non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug” were the most promising hotspots. **Conclusions:** Cancer-CSR has been increasing. Most of the reviews were came from the developed countries as well as the institutes in these countries. The knowledge base of were the methodology studies of systematic review, epidemiological data of cancer, and the reporting guideline of systematic reviews. The adjuvant therapy combined CRS, the screening of skin cancer and the management of cancer-related pain were the hotspots.

1. Introduction

With the development of evidence based medicine, the systematic review has been gradually considered as the high quality evidence⁽¹⁾. In 1993, British physician and epidemiologist Archie Cochrane and his colleagues developed the Cochrane Collaboration, which represents the watershed movement responsible for the biggest advances in systematic review methodology^(2, 3). Two years later, the Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (Cochrane Database Syst Rev) launched, a database of systematic reviews and meta-analyses which summarize and interpret the results of medical research, as well as contains different types of high-quality, independent evidence to inform healthcare decision-making⁽⁴⁻⁶⁾, and the 2017 Impact Factor of which is 6.754⁽⁷⁾. A Cochrane systematic review is a systematic review of research in health care and health policy that is published in the Cochrane Database Syst Rev, and has been an important resource of guideline making^(6, 8)

The scientific research of cancer in Cochrane Database Syst Rev has never been stopped. Cancer affects all of humankind, from a global perspective, which is the second leading cause of death worldwide. By 2018, nearly one in six deaths was caused by cancer (9.5 million)^(9, 10). It is worth noting that the burden of chronic diseases is disproportionately increasing in low-income countries and populations, and it is reported that nearly 80% of non-communicable disease-related deaths in low- and middle-income countries are caused by chronic diseases⁽¹¹⁾. The total annual economic cost of cancer care in the United States in 2017 is 147370 million, up 15.4 percent compared to 2010, according to Cancer Prevalence and

Cost of Care Projections in NIH⁽¹²⁾. Giving to the grave situation, cancer threatens the whole humankind and puts a huge economic burden on every country.

In order to assess trends in research activities of the cancer topic of Cochrane systematic reviews (Cancer-CSR), bibliometric analysis has been used, which is a quantitative analysis combining mathematics and statistics⁽¹³⁾. Bibliometric analysis focuses on the bibliometric characteristics of research in a particular field, helping investigators grasp the development priorities and trends in the field and guiding their follow-up work⁽¹⁴⁾.

This study performed a bibliometric analysis of the Cancer-CSR to establish the current knowledge visualization map, analyze the characteristics and trends of research topics in this field, compare the composition of topics in different dimensions, and find the research hotspots of keywords cluster analysis.

2. Materials And Methods

2.1 Data source and collection

Records found in Cancer-CSR were searched through the Web of Science Core Collection (WoSCC) database from Jan. 1, 2009 to Dec. 12, 2018. All retrievals were done within one day in order to avoid the bias caused by the updating of the daily database. The data from WoSCC were checked with the records in Cochrane Database Syst Rev by two reviewers (Yang KL and Gao Y) independently.

2.2 Tools and methods

EndNote X8 (Thomson Reuters (Scientific) LLC, Philadelphia, PA, US) was applied to manage the retrieved data, and CiteSpace IV and Excel (Microsoft, 2016) were applied to analyze and visualize the literature information.

CiteSpace IV, developed by Prof. Chaomei Chen, is a Java application that combines information visualization methods, bibliometrics, and data mining algorithms in an interactive visualization tool for extracting patterns from citation data, which is to facilitate the analysis of emerging trends in a knowledge domain^(15, 16). In this study, the individual network was derived from the 50 most highly cited papers in a one-year slice, and the cluster labels were showed by the log-likelihood ratio (LLR). Clusters of the same color represent co-citations or keywords made within the same time slice. The size of the node can reflect the number of the node is cited or appeared; the tree ring history of the node represents the number of papers published in different years. The wider the ring is in a certain year, the more frequently it is cited or appeared in the corresponding year; The larger the size of the cluster (that is, the more members contained in the cluster), the smaller the number of the labels⁽¹⁷⁾.

2.3 Data analysis and Visualization

The retrieved data were analyzed for the annual growth, co-citation analysis, and co-occurrence of countries, institutes, and keywords. The following index was focused on analysis:

(1) Centrality: The centrality of a node is a graphical theoretical property quantifying the importance of a node's position in the network. A commonly used centrality metric is the “betweenness centrality”⁽¹⁸⁾, which measures the percentage of the shortest path in the network to which a given node belongs. The high centrality node is around by the purple circle in the visualization.

(2) Visually salient nodes⁽¹⁶⁾: a. Landmark node: the landmark node can be rendered by different visual space attributes such as size, height, or volume, which are commonly used in network visualization; b. Pivot node: the pivot node, which joints between different networks, is either the common nodes shared by two networks or the gateway nodes that are connected by internetwork links.

3. Results

3.1 The basic characteristics

We retrieved all the Cancer-CSR one by one in WoSCC database. Ultimately, 607 documents were selected, published between 2009 and 2018. The number of publications has kept rising, with annual publications increasing from 25 in 2009 to 77 in 2018, with the 81 documents being published in the highest-producing year 2015. Moreover, the number of publications in the adjacent years increased significantly, reaching over 10 per year from 2009 to 2013. The polynomial curve fitting of publication growth in Cancer-CSR has significant correlation between publication year and the number of publications (the coefficient of determination (R^2)=0.8285). **Fig. 1** depicted the number of publications.

According to the content of which, the included reviews were classified into different topic categories. “Gastroenterology & hepatology”(n=111(18.3%)), “Gynaecology” (n=99(16.3%)), and “Blood disorders” (n=62(10.2%)) were the top three category among them. In addition, on the basis of the “review type” of Cochrane Library, most of the included reviews focused on Intervention, and only two of the included records were overview (**Table 1**).

Table 1 Descriptive Characteristics of the included Cancer-CSR

Category	Characteristic	Number (N=607, n (%))
Topic categories*	Gastroenterology & hepatology	111(18.3%)
	Gynaecology	99(16.3%)
	Blood disorders	62(10.2%)
	Thyroid & Breast disorders	51(8.4%)
	Neurology	31(5.1%)
	Lungs & airways	26(4.3%)
	Urology	24(4.0%)
	Skin disorders	21(3.5%)
	Oral disorders	13(2.1%)
	Ear, nose & throat	9(1.5%)
	Bone and soft tissue disorders	5(0.8%)
	Others	155(25.5%)
Publishing status	New research	105(17.3%)
	Conclusions changed	32(5.3%)
Review types	Intervention	577(95.1%)
	Diagnostic	28(4.6%)
	Overview	2(0.3%)

*Based on the content of *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*.

3.2 Distribution of countries and institutes

Table 2 The top 10 countries that published Cancer-CSR (N=940)

Rank	Country	Frequency (n (%))	Centrality
1	UK	318(33.8%)	0.39
2	USA	97(10.3%)	0.39
3	Australia	75(8.0%)	0.27
4	Germany	71(7.6%)	0.13
5	Netherlands	67(7.1%)	0.07
6	China	52(5.5%)	0.05
7	Canada	51(5.4%)	0.21
8	Italy	33(3.5%)	0.07
9	Denmark	18(1.9%)	0
10	Brazil	17(1.8%)	0.01

The selected reviews encompassed 32 countries. In the light of the list of top 10 countries launching Cochrane review in cancer field (**Table 2**), the publication of UK took up the most number (361), followed by the USA (97), Australia (75), Germany (71) and Netherlands (67). Among these 10 countries, the centrality of China (publications=52, centrality=0.05) was only a quarter of the centrality of Canada (publications=51, centrality=0.21) which had nearly the same number of publications as China. As was shown in **Fig. 2A**, the tree ring history of UK was the biggest one and was the richest in color. The nodes around by purple circle were UK, Canada, USA, Australia, and Germany, and the latest countries firstly published in 2018 were Austria, and Egypt.

The total of 178 institutes has involved in the co-occurrence network of institutes, as indicated in the **Table 3**. Among the top 10 institutes publishing reviews, six were located in UK, one in USA, one in Germany, one in Holland, and one in China. *Newcastle University* contributed most (52(6.1%)), with the biggest node in **Fig. 2B**, followed by *Oxford University* (39(4.5%)), *University Hospital of Cologne* (28(3.3%)), *Royal United Hospital* (25(2.9%)), *Churchill Hospital* (22(2.6%)) and *Manchester University* (22(2.6%)). The nodes of all these six institutes were around by purple circle, and the centrality of *Oxford University* (centrality=0.38) was the highest.

Table 3 The top 10 institutions that published Cancer-CSR ((N=828))

Rank	Institution	Country	Frequency (n (%))	Centrality
1	Newcastle University	UK	52(6.1%)	0.24
2	Oxford University	USA	39(4.5%)	0.38
3	University Hospital of Cologne	Germany	28(3.3%)	0.13
4	Royal United Hospital	UK	25(2.9%)	0.31
5	Churchill Hospital	UK	22(2.6%)	0.2
6	Manchester University	UK	22(2.6%)	0.18
7	Emma Children's Hospital	Holland	19(2.2%)	0.11
8	Sichuan University	China	17(2.0%)	0.06
9	University of Birmingham	UK	16(1.9%)	0.39
10	University of Nottingham	UK	14(1.6%)	0.01

3.3 Analysis of co-cited journals and references

There were 138 co-cited journals included. Among the top 10 co-cited journals/books, seven journals/books were from UK and three were from USA (**Table 4**), including the world-class top journals *Lancet*, *BMJ*, and *Ann Oncol*. What could inform from **Fig. 3** was that *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* was on the most prominent spot viewed as landmark node, with the highest citation (471). The nodes of *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, *Trials*, *Journal of Clinical Epidemiology*, *Annals of Internal Medicine* and *British Journal of Surgery* were around purple circle. The latest co-cited journals were listed in the figure.

Table 4 The top 10 co-cited journals/books in Cancer-CSR

Rank	Co-cited journal/book	Co-citation	Centrality	IF (2018)*	Country
1	Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews (CDSR)	471	0.11	6.754	UK
2	Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (C Hdb Sys)**	428	0.01	/	UK
3	Journal of Clinical Oncology (J Clin Oncol)	408	0.04	26.36	USA
4	British Medical Journal (BMJ)	367	0.08	23.562	UK
5	Lancet	349	0.02	53.254	UK
6	Cancer	329	0.09	6.537	USA
7	New England Journal of Medicine (N Engl J Med)	318	0.05	79.260	USA
8	Annals of Oncology (Ann Oncol)	286	0.08	13.930	UK
9	Statistics in Medicine (Stat Med)	279	0.03	1.932	UK
10	European Journal of Cancer (Eur J Cancer)	263	0.07	7.191	UK

As for the co-cited references, 672 references were divided into seven clusters (**Fig. 4A**). Due to the limitation of the software, the system automatically displayed the clustering with more than 10 members, while the clustering that did not meet this condition would not be displayed. The clusters were listed from 2007 to 2012: “psychosocial intervention” (#23, n=5), “active treatment” (#8, n=16), “cancer survivor” (#0, n=69), “hiv-1 infection” (#12, n=13), “liver metastases” (#2, n=39), “following computed tomography” (#15, n=9), and “cancer pain” (#3, n=35). The landmark node was *Higgins JPT, 2011* and the pivot nodes were labeled in the figure. The top 10 co-cited references were listed in **Table 5**. The references firstly co-cited in 2018 were listed in **Fig. 4B**.

Table 5 The top 10 co-cited references in Cancer-CSR

Rank	Co-cited reference	Co-citation	Citations
1	Higgins JPT, 2011.	534	Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
2	The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014	140	Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.
3	Higgins JPT, 2008.	66	Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.0.0. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2008.
4	Tierney JF, 2007.	51	Tierney JF, Stewart LA, et al. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. <i>Trials</i> , 2007
5	The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration 2011.	45	Review Manager (RevMan) [Computer program]. Version 5.1. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011.
6	Higgins JPT, 2003.	31	Higgins, J. P. T., Thompson, S. G., et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2003
7	Higgins JPT, 2009.	29	Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.0.2. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2009
8	Jemal A, 2008.	29	Jemal A, Siegel R, et al. Cancer Statistics, 2008. <i>CA A Cancer Journal for Clinicians</i> , 2008
9	Wood L, 2008	27	Wood L, Egger M, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. <i>BMJ: British Medical Journal</i> , 2008
10	Moher D, 2009	25	Moher D, Liberati A, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. <i>J Clin Epidemiol</i> 2009

3.4 Analysis of keywords

Three hundred and nine keywords derived from the 50 most highly cited papers in a one-year slice were classified into 12 clusters. The landmark nodes “randomized controlled trial” (n=223), “humans” (n=203) and “quality of life” (n=146) were in the center of **Fig. 5**. The clusters were listed in 2012 to 2015:

“cytoreductive surgery” (#0, n=44), “preventing bleeding” (#1, n=42), “resectable thoracic esophageal cancer” (#2, n=37), “lung cancer” (#3, n=37), “hiv-infected adult” (#8, n=17), “liver metastases” (#4, n=29), “haematopoietic stem cell transplantation” (#6, n=21), “preventing bleeding” (#9, n=16), “perioperative thromboprophylaxis” (#5, n=25), “adult palliative care patient” (#11, n=4), “visual inspection” (#7, n=21), and “non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug” (#10, n=9). The keywords contained in Cluster#0 (the biggest) and Cluster#7 and #10 (the latest) were showed in the figure.

4. Discussion

4.1 General information

In this study, the bibliometric analysis of Cancer-CSR was performed. A total of 607 publications in Cancer-CSR were retrieved using the online WoSCC database, covering many fields in cancer, such as gastrointestinal tumors⁽¹⁹⁾, gynecological oncology⁽²⁰⁾, haematological malignancies⁽²¹⁾, palliative and supportive care⁽²²⁾, and so on. Compared with other disciplines, the number of publications of cancer was higher than that in other topics in Cochrane Database Syst Rev⁽⁷⁾. This might be due to the Cochrane Review Group in Cochrane Library, which contained a variety of cancers, such as colorectal cancer group, breast cancer group, lung cancer group and so on⁽²³⁾. The Cochrane Review Group provides authors with methods and editorial support to prepare for the Cochrane review and manages the editing process. Since 2018, the Cochrane Review Group has been organized into eight Cochrane Networks to generate high-quality systematic reviews efficiently and timely, addressing the most important research questions to decision makers⁽⁸⁾.

UK, USA, Canada, Australia, and Germany were the countries with high centrality, which worked closely with other countries. UK ranked first in productivity, with the highest centrality, containing more than half of the top 10 contributive institutes. Although the publications of USA were only one-third of UK, the centrality was almost the same. China and Brazil were the only two developing countries among the top 10 contributive countries. However, as for the centrality, China was the last but one among the top 10 contributive countries, which indicated that the importance of the studies we Chinese researchers involved in was not high. On the other hand, the overall methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews by authors from China were similar to those from the USA⁽²⁴⁾. So, the possible reason may be that the topics of the Chinese Cancer-CSR studies are not attractive and innovative enough. Egypt and Austria were the first time to publish the reviews in Cancer-CSR during latest ten years, which focused more on the chemotherapy and multimodality therapy in cancer field^(25, 26).

With respect to the institutes involved, *Newcastle University*, one of the Ivy League schools and has the top medical school in UK, which was founded in 1834 as the College of medicine and surgery, was the most productive institution. The reviews of *Newcastle University* focused on the surgical treatment⁽²⁷⁾, chemotherapy⁽²⁸⁾ and prognosis⁽²⁹⁾ of gynecological cancer. The most cited review was the evaluation of the efficacy, safety, and cost-effectiveness of primary cytoreductive surgery in patients with advanced

epithelial ovarian cancer surgery⁽³⁰⁾, published in 2011. The top 10 contributive institutions collaborated closely with other institutions, except for the Sichuan University and the University of Nottingham. Checking the incidence rate of the districts of top 10 institutes and 10 countries, we also found that the incidence of all kinds of cancer in these districts was above the world average level (197.9)⁽³¹⁾.

4.2 Citation information

Among the top 10 co-cited journals/books, different journals usually favored publication on different scientific subjects. For example, *J Clin Oncol*, *Cancer*, *Ann Oncol* and *Eur J Cancer* preferred every respect of cancer, from epidemiology, carcinogenesis and biology through to innovations in cancer treatment and patient care; *Lancet* preferred surgical oncology; *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*, *BMJ*, and *N Engl J Med* were comprehensive journals; *Stat Med* focused on statistical the methods to a particular medical problem, and *C Hdb Sys* was the most significant book to all the researchers who intended to conduct systematic reviews, which is the official guide that describes in detail the process of preparing and maintaining Cochrane systematic reviews on the effects of healthcare interventions

The co-cited references were usually considered as the basics of the subject. Being-in Top 10 co-cited references, three versions of *C Hdb Sys* (*Higgins JPT.*, 2011; 2009; 2008) were included, owing to the Cochrane collaboration has driven the greatest advancement in system review methods, which has brought together more than 13,000 members and over 50,000 supporters come from more than 130 countries dedicated to systematic review⁽⁸⁾. The second most co-cited reference was about *Review Manager (RevMan)*⁽³²⁾, the most frequently used tool in meta-analysis, which facilitated preparation of protocols and full reviews, including characteristics of studies, comparison tables, study data and so on, and was also appropriate to the reviews of diagnostic test accuracy studies, reviews of studies of methodology and overviews of reviews. The rest top 10 co-cited references including methodology studies^(33, 34), epidemiological data of cancer⁽³⁵⁾, and the reporting guideline of systematic reviews⁽³⁶⁾. The latest co-cited references were focused on the diagnosis and treatment of skin cancer in adults⁽³⁷⁻³⁹⁾. All these co-cited references constituted the knowledge base of this field.

4.3 Research hotspots

The cluster of keywords could be used for detecting research hotspots, and monitoring the study frontiers transitions in a certain field⁽⁴⁰⁾ Here, we listed three hotspots of Cancer-CSR as follows:

#0 Cytoreductive surgery: Cytoreductive surgery (CRS) is a surgery which removes all visible lesions as much as possible and used to reduce tumor burden of patients and prolong survival, which has been applied in many kinds of cancer⁽⁴¹⁻⁴³⁾. Because of the unsatisfactory effects of traditional treatment, better treatment regimens were needed⁽⁴⁴⁾. The included studies about CRS covered the ovarian cancer⁽⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷⁾, colorectal cancer⁽⁴⁸⁾, neuroblastoma⁽⁴⁹⁾, breast cancer⁽⁵⁰⁾ and lung cancer⁽⁵¹⁾, which mostly focused on the different adjuvant therapy, different chemotherapeutic drugs and different dose of chemotherapy.

However, the evidence found was insufficient in these aspects, so new clinical trials are needed to solve these problems.

#7 visual inspection: Nonmelanoma of skin accounted for 5.8% of all new cancer cases in 2018 as well as melanoma of skin accounted for 1.6%. There were an estimated 1,000,000 new cases and 65,000 deaths worldwide, and the male incidence was about twice that of women. NMSC was the most commonly diagnosed cancer in North America, with Australia and New Zealand being the highest incidence rates countries, which partly because of the higher risk, but also because the detection rate of skin cancer (especially NMSC) was rising⁽⁵²⁾. One burgeoning approach that has impacted skin cancer detection was reflectance confocal microscopy (RCM), which noninvasively shows nuclear and cellular-level morphology in human skin in vivo^(53, 54). Compared with the dermoscopy, RCM had similar sensitivity but the specificity was two times superior, and it could reduce the number of biopsies of benign lesions as a second-level examination following dermoscopy⁽⁵⁵⁻⁵⁷⁾. Nevertheless, there were some pitfalls. For example, the differentiation of melanocytes from langerhans cells in melanocytic lesions lacks specificity, the misdiagnosis due to specific lesion or missed detection because of sampling error, as well as the clinical experience of the doctors⁽⁵⁸⁾. Considering the pitfalls and the large size of current microscopes, RCM has been constantly improving. On the one hand, the continuous improvement of technique focused on a smaller, lower-cost and easier-to-use microscopes, which was indispensable for dissemination⁽⁵⁹⁾. On the other hand, training the ability of dermatologists and pathologists to read and interpret RCM results at the bedside or remotely was the key to widespread acceptance and adoption of RCM imaging⁽⁵⁸⁾. What's more, there were four records in Cancer-CSR concentrated on the applying of RCM for diagnosing skin cancer in adults with any suspicious lesion⁽⁶⁰⁻⁶³⁾, which were all published in 2018.

#10 Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug: Increased survival rates for cancer patients, coupled with increasing complexity of cancer and the introduction of new therapies, made pain treatments more challenging^(64, 65). Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) were widely used to treat postoperative fever and surgical pain. What's more, there was increasing evidence that non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs have anticancer activity which could reduce the risk of cancer^(66, 67). However, there was no sufficient evidence of the included records about reducing cancer-related pain in children and adolescents⁽⁶⁸⁾, and no high-quality evidence to support the use of NSAIDs alone or in combination with opioids for the three step WHO cancer pain ladder⁽⁶⁹⁾.

4.4 Strengths and limitations

To the best of our knowledge, this study is the first bibliometric analysis the Cancer-CSR. Although all the reviews were written in English causing incomplete understandings and not in detail, the process of data analysis was still relatively objective. The research trends and hot spots of Cancer-CSR reflected that in systematic reviews in the cancer field to some extent, but it was not comprehensive enough, for the

Cochrane collaboration had greater scrutiny for systematic reviews, so there were not a lot of publications.

5. Conclusions

Cancer research is increasing in Cochrane Database Syst Rev. Most of the reviews were came from the developed countries as well as the institutes in these countries, like UK and USA. Co-cited references including C Hdb Sys and the guidelines of RevMan constituted the knowledge base of Cancer-CSR in the aspect of the methodology studies of systematic review, epidemiological data of cancer, and the reporting guideline of systematic reviews. What's more, the adjuvant therapy combined CRS, the screening of skin cancer and the management of cancer-related pain were the hotspots which needed more sufficient evidences to support the clinical decision making.

Abbreviations

Cancer-CSR=cancer topic of Cochrane systematic reviews; CRS=cytoreductive surgery; LLR=log-likelihood ratio; WoSCC=Web of Science Core Collection.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate: Not applicable

Consent for publication: Not applicable

Availability of data and material: The datasets used and analyzed during the current study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable requests.

Competing interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Funding: No funding was received for this work.

Authors' contributions:

KLY, JHZ, and JHT led the study design, data collection, statistical analysis, drafting and editing of the manuscript, and supervision. YG, YTC, ML, and CCL participated in the study design, and revised the article for important intellectual content. All authors read and approved the final manuscript and agreed on its submission

Acknowledgements: Not applicable

References

1. Tian J, Zhang J, Ge L, Yang K, Song F. The methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews from China and the USA are similar. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2017;85.
2. Bero L, Rennie D. The Cochrane Collaboration. Preparing, maintaining, and disseminating systematic reviews of the effects of health care. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*. 1993;703.
3. Djulbegovic B, Guyatt GH. Progress in evidence-based medicine: a quarter century on. *Lancet* (London, England). 2017;390:10092.
4. Weeks SM. The Cochrane Collaboration. *Western journal of nursing research*. 2013;35:10.
5. Noncommunicable diseases country profiles 2018. Available from: <https://www.who.int/nmh/publications/ncd-profiles-2018/en/>. Accessed by 20 March 2019.
6. Xiu-xia L, Ya Z, Yao-long C, Ke-hu Y, Zong-jiu Z. The reporting characteristics and methodological quality of Cochrane reviews about health policy research. *Health policy* (Amsterdam, Netherlands). 2015;119:4.
7. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/cdsr/about-cdsr>. Accessed by 19 March 2019.
8. About Cochrane Reviews. Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/about/about-cochrane-reviews>. Accessed by 20 March 2019.
9. International Agency for Research on Cancer (IARC) [homepage on the Internet]. Available from: <https://www.who.int/cancer/en/>. Accessed by 21 March 2019.
10. Cancer Today. Available from: <https://www.iarc.fr>. Accessed by 20 March 2019.
11. Terzic A, Waldman S. Chronic diseases: the emerging pandemic. *Clin Transl Sci*. 2011;4:3.
12. Graph by Cancer Site & Phase of Care. Available from: <https://costprojections.cancer.gov/graph.php>. Accessed by 20 March 2019.
13. Dalpé R. Bibliometric analysis of biotechnology. *Scientometrics*. 2002;55:2.
14. Ellegaard O, Wallin JA. The bibliometric analysis of scholarly production: How great is the impact? *Scientometrics*. 2015;105:3.
15. Synnestvedt MB, Chen C, Holmes JH. CiteSpace II: visualization and knowledge discovery in bibliographic databases. *AMIA Annual Symposium proceedings AMIA Symposium*. 2005.
16. Chen C. CiteSpace II: Detecting and visualizing emerging trends and transient patterns in scientific literature; 2006.
17. Chen C. Searching for intellectual turning points: progressive knowledge domain visualization. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2004;101 Suppl 1:5303-10.
18. Freeman LC. Centrality in social networks conceptual clarification. *Social Networks*. 1978;1:3.
19. Holme O, Bretthauer M, Fretheim A, Odgaard-Jensen J, Hoff G. Flexible sigmoidoscopy versus faecal occult blood testing for colorectal cancer screening in asymptomatic individuals. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2013;9.

20. Arbyn M, Xu L, Simoens C, Martin-Hirsch PP. Prophylactic vaccination against human papillomaviruses to prevent cervical cancer and its precursors. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2018;5.
21. Rensen N, Gemke RJ, van Dalen EC, Rotteveel J, Kaspers GJ. Hypothalamic-pituitary-adrenal (HPA) axis suppression after treatment with glucocorticoid therapy for childhood acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2017;11.
22. Bell RF, Eccleston C, Kalso EA. Ketamine as an adjuvant to opioids for cancer pain. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2017;6.
23. Browse by Cochrane Review Group. Available from: <https://www.cochranelibrary.com/browse-by-review-group>. Accessed by 20 March 2019.
24. Tian J, Zhang J, Ge L, Yang K, Song F. The methodological and reporting quality of systematic reviews from China and the USA are similar. Journal of clinical epidemiology. 2017;85.
25. Goldkuhle M, Dimaki M, Gartlehner G. Nivolumab for adults with Hodgkin s lymphoma (a rapid review using the software RobotReviewer). Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2018
26. Abdel-Rahman O, Elsayed Z, Mohamed H, Eltobgy M. Radical multimodality therapy for malignant pleural mesothelioma. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2018;1:3.
27. Ang C, Chan KK, Bryant A, Naik R, Dickinson HO. Ultra-radical (extensive) surgery versus standard surgery for the primary cytoreduction of advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2011;4:4.
28. Galaal K, Godfrey K, Naik R, Kucukmetin A, Bryant A. Adjuvant radiotherapy and/or chemotherapy after surgery for uterine carcinosarcoma; 2011.
29. Nama V, Nordin A, Bryant A. Patient-reported outcome measures for follow-up after gynaecological cancer treatment. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2013;11:11.
30. Elattar A, Bryant A, Winter-Roach BA, Hatem M, Naik R. Optimal primary surgical treatment for advanced epithelial ovarian cancer. The Cochrane database of systematic reviews. 2011;66:8.
31. All cancers fact. Available from: <https://gco.iarc.fr/today/data/factsheets/cancers/39-All-cancers-fact-sheet.pdf>. Accessed by 20 March 2019.
32. Review Manager (RevMan) 5.3 ed: Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre, The Cochrane Collaboration; 2014.
33. Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Gherzi D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. Trials. 2007;8:16.
34. Wood L, Egger M, Gluud LL, Schulz KF, Juni P, Altman DG, et al. Empirical evidence of bias in treatment effect estimates in controlled trials with different interventions and outcomes: meta-epidemiological study. Bmj. 2008;336:7644.
35. Jemal A, Siegel R, Ward E, Hao Y, Xu J, Murray T, et al. Cancer statistics, 2008. CA: a cancer journal for clinicians. 2008;58:2.

36. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *Journal of clinical epidemiology*. 2009;62:10.
37. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Grainge MJ, Chuchu N, Ferrante di Ruffano L, Matin RN, et al. Visual inspection for diagnosing cutaneous melanoma in adults. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2018;12.
38. Ferrante di Ruffano L, Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Chuchu N, Bayliss SE, Davenport C, et al. Optical coherence tomography for diagnosing skin cancer in adults. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2018;12.
39. Pasquali S, Hadjinicolaou AV, Chiarion Sileni V, Rossi CR, Mocellin S. Systemic treatments for metastatic cutaneous melanoma. *The Cochrane database of systematic reviews*. 2018;2.
40. Yu D, Chao X. Mapping research on carbon emissions trading: a co-citation analysis. *Renewable & Sustainable Energy Reviews*. 2017;74.
41. Lyster HK. Cytoreductive surgery and intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis. *Annals of Surgery*. 1995;221:2.
42. Min HJ, Suh JW, Yun JS, Namgung H, Park DG. Cytoreductive surgery and intraperitoneal chemotherapy for peritoneal carcinomatosis of colorectal cancer: 2-year follow-up results at a single institution in Korea. *Annals of Surgical Treatment & Research*. 2016;91:4.
43. Jaaback K, Johnson N, Lawrie TA. Intraperitoneal chemotherapy for the initial management of primary epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2006;11:1.
44. Wallace S, Kumar A, Gree MM, Weaver A, Mariani A, Langstraat C, et al. Efforts at maximal cytoreduction improve survival in ovarian cancer patients, even when complete gross resection is not feasible. *Gynecologic Oncology*. 2017;145:1.
45. Galaal K, Naik R, Bristow RE, Patel A, Bryant A, Dickinson HO. Cytoreductive surgery plus chemotherapy versus chemotherapy alone for recurrent epithelial ovarian cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;6.
46. Faluyi O, Mackean M, Gourley C, Bryant A, Dickinson HO. Interventions for the treatment of borderline ovarian tumours. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;9.
47. Williams C, Simera I, Bryant A, Platt J. Tamoxifen for relapse of ovarian cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;3.
48. Neutzling CB, Lustosa SAS, Proenca IM, da Silva EMK, Matos D. Stapled versus handsewn methods for colorectal anastomosis surgery. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2012;2.
49. Yalçin B, Kremer LCM, van Dalen EC. High-dose chemotherapy and autologous haematopoietic stem cell rescue for children with high-risk neuroblastoma. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2015;10.
50. Butters DJ, Ghera D, Wilcken N, Kirk SJ, Mallon PT. Addition of drug/s to a chemotherapy regimen for metastatic breast cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;11.

51. O'Rourke N, Roqué i Figuls M, Farré Bernadó N, Macbeth F. Concurrent chemoradiotherapy in non-small cell lung cancer. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2010;6.
52. Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA: a cancer journal for clinicians*. 2018;68:6.
53. New KC, Petroll WM, Boyde A, Martin L, Corcuff P, Leveque JL, et al. In Vivo imaging of human teeth and skin using real-time confocal microscopy. *Scanning*. 2011;13:5.
54. Corcuff P, Leveque JL. In vivo vision of the human skin with the tandem scanning microscope. *Dermatology (Basel, Switzerland)*. 1993;186:1.
55. Guitera P, Menzies SW, Longo C, Cesinaro AM, Scolyer RA, Pellacani G. In vivo confocal microscopy for diagnosis of melanoma and basal cell carcinoma using a two-step method: analysis of 710 consecutive clinically equivocal cases. *The Journal of investigative dermatology*. 2012;132:10.
56. Gerger A, Hofmann-Wellenhof R, Langsenlehner U, Richtig E, Koller S, Weger W, et al. In vivo confocal laser scanning microscopy of melanocytic skin tumours: diagnostic applicability using unselected tumour images. *The British journal of dermatology*. 2008;158:2.
57. Guitera P, Pellacani G, Longo C, Seidenari S, Avramidis M, Menzies SW. In vivo reflectance confocal microscopy enhances secondary evaluation of melanocytic lesions. *The Journal of investigative dermatology*. 2009;129:1.
58. Rajadhyaksha M, Marghoob A, Rossi A, Halpern AC, Nehal KS. Reflectance confocal microscopy of skin in vivo: From bench to bedside. *Lasers in surgery and medicine*. 2017;49:1.
59. Yin C, Glaser AK, Leigh SY, Chen Y, Wei L, Pillai PC, et al. Miniature in vivo MEMS-based line-scanned dual-axis confocal microscope for point-of-care pathology. *Biomedical optics express*. 2016;7:2.
60. Dinnes J, Bamber J, Chuchu N, Bayliss SE, Takwoingi Y, Davenport C, et al. High-frequency ultrasound for diagnosing skin cancer in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2018;12.
61. Ferrante di Ruffano L, Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Chuchu N, Bayliss SE, Davenport C, et al. Optical coherence tomography for diagnosing skin cancer in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2018;12.
62. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Saleh D, Chuchu N, Bayliss SE, Patel L, et al. Reflectance confocal microscopy for diagnosing cutaneous melanoma in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2018;12.
63. Dinnes J, Deeks JJ, Chuchu N, Saleh D, Bayliss SE, Takwoingi Y, et al. Reflectance confocal microscopy for diagnosing keratinocyte skin cancers in adults. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews*. 2018;12.
64. Davis MP, Mehta Z. Opioids and Chronic Pain: Where Is the Balance? *Current oncology reports*. 2016;18:12.
65. Chwistek M. Recent advances in understanding and managing cancer pain [version 1; peer review: 3 approved]. *F1000Research*. 2017;6:945.

66. Moody TW, Leyton J, Zakowicz H, Hida T, Kang Y, Jakowlew S, et al. Indomethacin reduces lung adenoma number in A/J mice. Anticancer research. 2001;21:3b

67. Jiang W, Wang L, Zhang J, Shen H, Dong W, Zhang T, et al. Effects of postoperative non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs on long-term survival and recurrence of patients with non-small cell lung cancer. Medicine. 2018;97:39.

68. Cooper TE, Heathcote LC, Anderson B, Grégoire MC, Ljungman G, Eccleston C. Non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) for cancer-related pain in children and adolescents. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2017;7.

69. Derry S, Wiffen PJ, Moore RA, McNicol ED, Bell RF, Carr DB, et al. Oral nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs) for cancer pain in adults. Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews. 2017;7.

Figures

Figure 1

The publication trend of Cancer-CSR during 2009-2018.

Figure 2

The distribution of countries and institutes. (A)The network map of countries involved in Cancer-CSR; (B) The network map of institutes involved in Cancer-CSR

Figure 3

The co-citation map of journals from the reviews in Cancer-CSR

Figure 4

The analysis of references. (A) The co-citation map of references from reviews in Cancer-CSR, (B) The timezone view of co-cited references from reviews in Cancer-CSR