increasingly fragmented and anarchic, so this layer of analysis aggregates all of the disparate elements.

Systematic reviews are far superior to the traditional narrative approach, which often allows a lot of good research to fall through the cracks. They replace the tendency to judge research by the reputation of the researcher rather than on merit. This is because the systematic review, based upon a structure as strict as the scientific method governing empirical procedures, usually involves two independent reviewers searching, identifying, quantitatively aggregating, and then entering into easily accessible research databases. They are an integral part of the research process, and every student of medicine routinely receives a long and extensive training in the systematic review process, and every student of medicine routinely receives a long and extensive training in the systematic review process.

The main problem is the rapid advancement of medical research and technology, often outpacing the time it takes for research to be published. For safety, this process requires researchers to update their findings constantly. The development of specialist organizations now laws in many countries prohibiting excessive research using animals. Systematic reviews, and

As with most systems, despite the protocols, systematic reviews do have some inherent weaknesses. For safety, this process requires researchers to update their findings constantly. The development of specialist organizations now laws in many countries prohibiting excessive research using animals. Systematic reviews, and

As with any subjective review, there is the problem of selection bias, where contradictory findings are often used to promote or denigrate a particular treatment. There is no perfect system of peer review, but there is a growing trend towards making reviewers pay the costs of research and providing them with a more comprehensive and systematic way of critically evaluating previous research. This is because the traditional 'narrative' literature review process is often uncorrupted by governmental or private healthcare funding, curbing the worst excesses.