

CONTENTS

Author's Note ix

Introduction	1
PART I. WHAT TO BELIEVE	15
1 Birth of a Movement	17
2 Evidence-Based Medicine	56
PART II. WHAT WORKS	91
3 Social Policy: The Rise of the Randomistas	93
4 Policing: Evidence on Patrol	119
5 Conservation: Evidence for the Planet	147
6 Business: Evidence-Based Management	174
7 Education and Policy: Evidence in School and Government	198

PART III. WHAT TO DO	231
8 A Crisis of Evidence: The Pandemic and Beyond	233
9 Children and Parenting: Evidence-Empowered Families	263
Afterword: How to Join the Evidence Revolution	280

Acknowledgements 289

Key Sources and References 293

Index 337

Introduction

THE BEST-SELLING PARENTING book of all time is *Baby and Child Care*, by the American paediatrician Benjamin Spock. First published in 1946, the book advised parents to be loving and to trust their instincts—a welcome change from the rigid, disciplinary approach that had been promoted in previous years. Spock’s book quickly became the favourite childcare manual for new parents. It sold more than 50 million copies in over 40 languages, making it one of the most popular books ever published. At one point in American history, it was said, only the Bible had sold more.

In the 1958 edition, Spock made a small change to the book’s text. He started recommending that babies be put to sleep on their fronts, rather than on their backs, as he’d suggested before. Spock said that infants lying on their backs were more likely to choke on their own vomit and that the position might flatten their heads. His recommendation was mirrored by many other sources—and parents enthusiastically followed the advice. The proportion of babies that slept on their fronts rose steeply in the United States and some other Western countries during the 1960s and 70s. My mum, who still has her worn copy of Dr Spock’s book, obediently laid me and my sister in our cots this way.

One reason the advice changed was a study published in 1945 by an eminent paediatrician called Paul Woolley Jr. He examined—and dismissed—the idea that young babies who front-sleep might be at risk of suffocation because they were not yet strong enough to lift up their heads. He said he'd done studies in which he covered babies with different types of bedding and then analysed the air they breathed. The only time he detected a risky drop in oxygen or increase in carbon dioxide level, he wrote, was when he covered infants tightly with a rubber sheet and secured it at the sides. This was as unconvincing as it was bizarre: Woolley did not report how many babies he had studied or give details of his methods. But because Woolley was an eminent figure in his field, what he said carried a lot of weight. The influential 'blanket experiment' probably helped persuade Spock to recommend front sleeping, along with reports that this position genuinely improved the breathing of infants who were born preterm.

Something more sinister was starting to happen to babies in some Western countries around this time: a growing number of them were dying suddenly and inexplicably in their cribs. By 1964, around 25 out of every 1,000 children in the United States were dying from sudden infant death syndrome or SIDS. (Today that figure is around 1 out of 1,000.) "It is difficult to read a city newspaper over an extended period of time and not be impressed by the frequency with which infants appear to be asphyxiated in their beds," read one report.

The cause of the rising deaths was a matter of fierce debate. Some, like Spock, thought that infants choked on vomit. Others had different ideas. In 1960, scientists proposed that some babies suffered an allergic reaction to milk when they regurgitated a little of their milky stomach contents and then inhaled it. These researchers studied guinea pigs that had been sensitised to cow's milk and found that many of the animals died quickly

and quietly when they breathed in milk. It was a stretch to say that what happened in guinea pigs also happened in human babies—but the ‘aspiration hypothesis’ gained traction nevertheless. From the 1940s to 1970s, this and other theories swirled around while the number of deaths from SIDS steadily climbed. An epidemic, it was eventually called.

What was missing in all this was evidence from rigorous empirical research. Sudden infant death is fortunately a rare event. To find a cause, there was a need for careful studies comparing a group of babies who had died from SIDS with similar ‘control’ babies from the same community and of the same age, sex and background health. When carefully conducted, these case-control studies could reveal differences between the two groups that might explain the babies’ deaths.

In 1965, researchers in the UK published the first well-conducted case-control study, comparing over 100 children who had died under two years of age with a control group. The study noted ominously that cases were “found face downwards rather more frequently” than the controls, but the data did not pinpoint any particular cause.

The second case-control study, published in 1970, compared around 140 babies who had died in Northern Ireland with a similar number of matched controls. The data hinted that sleeping position was linked to increased risk, but the association was not deemed statistically significant. The researchers were sifting through lots of possible risk factors and dismissed this one as unimportant.

It took another 16 years for doctors to see the link between sleeping position and SIDS. In 1986, Susan Beal, a paediatrician

who studied hundreds of SIDS cases in South Australia, was the first to report that the death rate was higher in children who slept on their fronts. In 1990, a study in *The British Medical Journal* found that SIDS infants were nearly nine times more likely to have been sleeping on their fronts than those in a comparison group and were also more likely to have been more heavily wrapped.

Eventually, the weight of evidence was impossible to ignore: Spock's advice about front-sleeping had been lethally incorrect. In 1991, the UK launched a 'Back to Sleep' campaign, which encouraged parents to put babies down on their backs. A year later, the American Academy of Pediatrics recommended back-sleeping. Other countries were also making the switch.

As back-sleeping became the norm, the incidence of SIDS dropped like a stone—by as much as 70% in some countries. This provided the strongest evidence of all that front-sleeping increases the risk of sudden infant death, even though it is still not fully understood why. Today, parents are advised to minimise the risk by always putting infants to sleep on their backs, by sharing a room with their baby and by avoiding loose bedding, overheating and smoking.

The advocacy of front-sleeping by Spock and others is now understood to have been one of the most lethal pieces of unsubstantiated advice in the history of child health. What makes it more tragic is that the link with infant death might have been detected earlier.

Of course, it's easy to see with hindsight something that was not clear at the time. The association between SIDS and front-sleeping was difficult to detect without large numbers of cases

and controls. Some studies over the years hinted at an increased risk from front-sleeping, but they had too few children in them to be statistically sure.

The solution in this situation is for scientists to combine data from studies as they go along. That way, they can build up information on a widening group of cases and controls. The weight of evidence accumulates until it's enough to tip the scale.

In 2005, when a research team in the UK did this by going back and combining data from historical studies on SIDS, they were shocked. There had been sufficient evidence that front-sleeping significantly increased risk as early as 1970, when the numbers from just the first two studies were pooled. At this point, the data showed that front-sleepers were three times as likely to die as those who slept on their backs. If this had been noticed, scientists could have tested whether advising parents to adopt back-sleeping lowered the death rate. Instead, parents were commonly advised to put their babies to sleep on their fronts for at least another 18 years. The UK research team calculated that at least 50,000 deaths in the USA, Europe and Australasia—and incalculable grief of parents—could have been prevented if evidence from research on SIDS had been synthesised and acted on in 1970.

The SIDS tragedy is a powerful cautionary tale in science. It shows that advice based on unsubstantiated opinion like Spock's can do terrible harm. It reveals how important it is for scientists to conduct careful studies to find causes. And it illustrates how vital it is to not rely on one study—but to synthesise all of them in order to understand the body of evidence as a whole.

I first became interested in writing a book about evidence in May 2013, when I visited London's impressive Royal Society of

Medicine. I was there to interview Iain Chalmers, a doctor and researcher, as part of work on my previous book. Chalmers is incredibly self-deprecating, despite his work having helped probably millions of people around the world. (He told me I'd recognise him by looking for someone who was short, fat and balding.) As a science journalist, I was already steeped in the world of research and medicine, but my conversation with Chalmers would change how I thought about both.

In the 1960s, Chalmers realised that much of what he'd been taught in medical school was wrong. Most decisions about treatment were based on someone's opinion ("do this because I think it's right") or conventional wisdom ("do it this way because that's how it's always been done"). This meant that two doctors with differing opinions might give a patient different advice for the same predicament. Chalmers was troubled by this. What was he supposed to believe? He later realised that some children in his care probably died because he handed out wrong advice that he'd been taught.

Inspired by a doctor called Archie Cochrane, Chalmers realised that a better way to work out whether a treatment helps or harms is through evidence generated by scientific research. One of the most powerful experimental methods for testing treatments is a randomised controlled trial, in which similar people are randomly assigned to receive a therapy or not. If those in the treatment group clearly improve more, on average, than those in the control group, it suggests the therapy is effective. Scientists also carry out observational studies—such as the SIDS ones—in which they carefully observe groups of people to try and unpick the causes of disease.

Empirical evidence generated through careful experimental and observational research is the most reliable way to find out

whether a treatment is effective.¹ The history of medicine is littered with examples of practices that were once assumed to work and later found through research to be useless or harmful—front-sleeping being one tragic example.

Although these scientific methods have been around for decades, the ‘conventional wisdom and questionable opinion’ style of practising Western medicine predominated all the way up to the early 1990s. But then a handful of pioneering doctors in Canada, and others including Chalmers, challenged the way things were done. They argued that medical practices should be based on evidence from empirical research, such as randomised trials, rather than the hunches of doctors. This approach was radical when it first emerged; a lot of established physicians didn’t like annoying upstarts like Chalmers questioning their authority. But it quickly caught on, sparking a revolution known as evidence-based medicine, which raced around the world and has become the foundation of medicine in many countries today.

Chalmers’ insight went further than this. He understood that looking at one study at a time could be problematic. Some scientific studies produce misleading results if they are poorly done or through chance alone. Some, like the early SIDS studies, are too small to detect an effect. Drawing a conclusion from one study risks being like the blind men in the parable who try—and

1. I use the term evidence in most of this book as shorthand for ‘evidence from empirical research,’ meaning information collected by careful observation and experimentation. There are other types of evidence, including evidence in a court of law and evidence that people accrue based on their own lived experience. The word evidence means information indicating whether a belief or proposition is true or valid. The word derives from the Latin *evidens*, which means obvious, apparent or clear. Even in scientific research, the word is used in different ways: a study in 2024 found 54 different definitions of evidence across health and social science.

fail—to describe an elephant by feeling only one part of its body. In research, assessing the totality of rigorous evidence is usually the best way to reveal whether a treatment really works.

In 1993, Chalmers and a group of like-minded folk started a pioneering group called the Cochrane Collaboration, which was dedicated to synthesising evidence from clinical trials to reveal what works to improve health. They adopted a technique called a systematic review, in which scientists systematically comb the world's academic literature for all studies that can answer a question, and then statistically combine the results. (Other types of 'evidence synthesis' combine research in different ways.)

Today, tens of thousands of systematic reviews exist in medicine and they are used to create recommended guidelines for doctors about how to treat patients. These reviews have brought about life-saving changes in medicine, including the adoption of antenatal steroids to save the lives of premature babies and improved care for people with breast cancer and stroke. Systematic reviews are the invisible bedrock of knowledge on which modern medicine is based.

Learning about systematic reviews and evidence synthesis was eye-opening to me, even though I work at *Nature*—one of the leading science journals in the world. We've published some of the most important scientific advances ever made, from the discovery of the neutron to the structure of DNA to the sequence of the human genome. I've written and edited hundreds of news articles about key advances myself.

And yet I realised that most scientists today still trade in the currency of the single academic publication, publishing one paper after another because that's how they make their names. Hardly any of them spent time trying to make sense of what the world already knows by synthesising existing evidence.

Chalmers once called this the “scandalous failure of science to cumulate evidence scientifically.”

That medicine should be based on empirical scientific evidence sounds glaringly obvious now, but few people aside from doctors realise that the term evidence-based medicine is barely 35 years old. I didn't, until my conversation with Chalmers piqued my interest and I started reading more. I quickly learned that evidence-based medicine is part of a bigger movement—dubbed an evidence revolution. Before long, I was interviewing people who are passionate about evidence in fascinating disciplines that I'd never explored before.

For decades, some researchers have been conducting randomised trials to test the effectiveness of social policies, just like doctors test a drug. These include programmes designed to boost employment or education, or to cut crime. One of the earliest experiments, in 1981, randomly assigned perpetrators of domestic violence in Minneapolis to be arrested or cautioned. The results suggested that arrest cut the rate of repeat violence—and led to sweeping (and controversial) changes in police practice in many countries. There are now several thousand randomised trials and other studies that test ways to cut crime, and evidence-based policing is gaining traction across the world, including in Scotland Yard, the famed headquarters of London's Metropolitan Police.

Schools, like police forces, are also increasingly informed by evidence from research. There is a growing mountain of randomised trials showing that some practices in education—like giving students meaningful feedback and good-quality tutoring—are particularly good at helping children learn.

Others, like streaming kids according to ability and reducing class size, are not as cost-effective. Evidence-based education has not revolutionised schools in the way that evidence-based medicine transformed hospitals—but some researchers are intent on changing that.

Other fields have embraced evidence to differing extents. In development economics, the revolution took off like a rocket when, in the mid-1990s, some economists started using randomised trials to test whether programmes, such as buying textbooks for schools and offering incentives to vaccinate children, could help families living in poverty. This approach rapidly swept development economics and won three researchers—Esther Duflo, Abhijit Banerjee and Michael Kremer—a Nobel Prize in 2019. These researchers are sometimes called ‘randomistas’ because of their devotion to randomised trials.

Elsewhere, the revolution has been slow to take hold. In 2018, I met Eric Barends, a charismatic figure wearing a T-shirt saying “Keep calm and ask for the evidence.” Barends is fighting a lonely battle to turn management into an evidence-based field while living out of an old school bus in California. I’d run a large team of people at *Nature* using a patchwork of common sense, advice, tips from training courses and popular books. It was humbling to realise that a lot of standard management practices—like performance appraisals—are not supported by strong evidence showing they help. Evidence-based management offers a more rational way to run a team based on research, but struggles to gain traction in the face of business books and management fads.

The evidence revolution is filled with passionate rebels like Barends—evidence warriors fighting to change their fields. I’ve met quite a few over the several years and numerous interviews

it took to research this book. Many of them—like Barends—stumbled on the story of evidence-based medicine, and then a lightbulb went on in their heads. It dawned on them that practices in *their* field were based on conventional wisdom, just like those in medicine once were. Inspired, they started doing randomised trials or squirrelling away evidence into systematic reviews to find out which practices really work. Once they'd seen the compelling logic of using science this way, they found it hard to do anything else.

These people share a simple belief that if we did less of the things that science shows don't work and more of the things that do, the world could be a better place. This is logical, intuitive—and, as it turns out, extraordinarily hard to achieve.



The COVID pandemic—which ripped around the world as I was writing this book—exposed some of the biggest obstacles to evidence. Research did help chart a route out of the pandemic: vaccines, which were shown to be effective in randomised trials, saved millions of lives. Organisations also struggled to synthesise and act on the available evidence on drugs, masks and other issues quickly enough, in part because studies were gushing out so fast. This problem has continued: in 2022, over three million academic articles were published in science and engineering—over 50% more than in 2012. This firehose of research makes efforts to synthesise and make sense of it harder but more important.

Another opposing force that COVID highlighted is the growing rejection of evidence. During the pandemic, world leaders like US president Donald Trump ignored and twisted evidence from research and an epidemic of misinformation

made it hard to distinguish real facts from ‘alternative’ ones. Scientists worry that the erosion of trust in evidence is worsening under Trump’s second presidency, and AI could undermine it too. AI-powered chatbots like ChatGPT can churn out misinformation and generate credible-sounding but potentially misleading summaries of research.

Despite these headwinds, the evidence revolution has been quietly advancing. In autumn 2024, hundreds of scientists attended a Global Evidence Summit in Prague to discuss how policies based on evidence can solve critical problems such as climate change and poor health. In late summer 2025, a group of major scientific funders announced they were investing over \$120 million in AI-powered systems to supply evidence syntheses to governments worldwide. Evidence was being discussed at the United Nations, because evidence-based policies are one of the most promising ways to achieve global goals such as cutting hunger and poverty. Setbacks are inevitable, but most researchers are resolute in their belief that evidence can help improve the world.



There’s another reason that I find this movement so compelling. Understanding evidence is empowering. It allows people to think more critically about the claims they encounter in their own lives—that a wonder drug will improve health, a government policy will bolster schools, or a parenting fad will benefit children. It gives us more confidence to ask for evidence behind a claim and consider it when making decisions.

Take parenting, for instance, which is rife with contradictory advice and unsubstantiated claims. When my children were born, I approached parenting as I did management: by cobbling

together advice from books and the internet, and by learning as I went along. I wish I'd understood how much evidence there was that could help. Some parenting programmes—such as one called Triple P, which emphasises clear, positive feedback and rules—have been shown in multiple randomised trials to improve outcomes for children. In other cases, there is not enough evidence to provide clear answers—such as how much screen time is appropriate for kids. Either way, weighing up the evidence with a family's own values and circumstances can potentially help parents reach more confident decisions about what to do.

Some scientists told me that when they came across the ideas of evidence-based medicine, it changed how they viewed the world. I've found that too. Now when I receive a medical diagnosis, I search for systematic reviews to get an overview of potential treatments. When I interview scientists about their latest study, I try to ask whether the wider body of research points to the same conclusion.

Evidence rarely provides certainty. Often the evidence simply isn't there, or is hard to find, or is complex and contradictory—and new studies can come along that overturn existing ideas. But it can reduce uncertainty and improve decisions—and that can be life-changing. I hope this book helps you figure out what claims to believe, what actions work and, sometimes, what to do.

INDEX

Page numbers in italics indicate figures and tables.

- Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty
Action Lab (J-PAL), 108, 110,
115, 118
- absence of evidence, 39n6, 155
- Academy of Management, 178,
180
- advice, parenting, 12–13, 268–74
- Africa Evidence Network, 238
- Agile, 188, 189
- allocation bias: arrested suspects,
12.4n3; phenomenon, 26
- allocation concealment, 123, 125,
155n4, 264
- Altringham, John, bat bridges,
148–49, 173
- Amazon, 219
- American Academy of Pediatrics
(AAP), 4, 277
- American College of Physicians, 72
- American Educational Research
Association, 36
- amputations, 20–21
- Angrist, Joshua: Duflo and, 102;
Nobel Prize in Economics, 102n2
- apartheid: racial segregation,
233–34, 237; redressing legacy
of, 237
- Arnold Ventures, 223, 228–29
- aspirin, heart attacks, 30
- Attending Physician* (publication), 57
- Axelrod, Beth, 187
- Baby and Child Care* (Spock), 1, 268
- bacterial infection, pneumococcal
pneumonia, 87–88
- Bain & Company, 184
- Bananarama principle, 216, 216n12
- Bandiera, Oriana, 109
- Banerjee, Abhijit, 10; Duflo and, 103,
104, 106, 108, 110, 115, 118
- Barends, Eric, 174–76, 286; evidence-
based management, 189–93, 193–96;
evidence-based practice, 181–82;
evidence revolution, 10–11;
management characteristics, 183–84
- Barnard, Chester, 177
- Baron, Jon, 202–5, 209, 222–23;
campaign for Democratic
nomination, 227–29
- bat bridges, conservation and, 147–49,
153, 157, 158, 173
- Battle of Fontenoy (1745), 21
- Beal, Susan, sleeping position and
SIDS, 3–4
- Beattie, Peter, 165
- Before-After Control-Impact (BACI),
156
- Behavioural Insights Team, 219
- Benchmark Analytics, 143
- benchmarking, management, 185–86
- Bennett, Bill, 198
- beriberi, 29
- Berthinussen, Anna, bat bridges, 148

- biblical story, doubting Thomas, 193–94
- Biden administration, 227
- Bill and Melinda Gates Foundation, 110
- bipolar disorder, 174
- Blair, Tony, 206, 218, 219
- Bond University, 249
- Boruch, Robert, 111, 116
- Bötter, Jacob, 190
- Bottom Line, 223
- Boutron, Isabelle, 252n9
- Bouza, Tony, 121; Sherman and, 121–22, 142
- Bown, Stephen, 22
- BRAC, Bangladeshi organisation, 109
- Bradford Hill, Austin, 24–26, 46; influence on Cochrane, 30; randomised controlled trials, 60; streptomycin trial, 58, 123
- breast cancer, 8, 81
- Brigalow Declaration, 165
- Briner, Rob, 191
- British Admiralty, lemon juice ration, 23
- British Medical Journal, The*, 4, 49, 76, 80, 253
- Brown, Tracey, 282
- Brydon, Meg, 222
- Bush, George W., administration, 206, 207n5
- business. *See* evidence-based management
- butterfly species, conservation, 150–51
- Cambridge Crime Harm Index, 140
- Campbell, Donald, 116
- Campbell Collaboration, 117, 131, 260, 286
- Card, David, 102n2
- Cardiff Model, hotspot policing, 135–37
- cardiovascular disease, 81
- Carley, Simon, 242–44, 246–47
- Carnegie Mellon University, 176
- Cartwright, Nancy, 226
- case-control study, 34
- casual benchmarking, 185–86
- Catholic Church, 179
- Center for Effective Global Action, 110
- Center for Evidence-Based Management, 182, 189, 196
- Center for Global Development, 107
- Center for Rapid Evidence Synthesis, Uganda, 239
- Centre for Evidence-Based Medicine, Oxford 83
- Chalmers, Iain, 6–7, 9, 28, 31, 32–33, 46, 151, 172, 181, 241, 248, 248n5, 262; antenatal corticosteroids, 53–55; Campbell Collaboration, 116; Cochrane and, 6, 28, 31–32, 47; Cochrane Centre, 47–49; Cochrane Collaboration, 8, 49–51, 172, 233–34; *Effective Care in Pregnancy and Childbirth*, 43, 44; Glasziou and, 66, 66n2; Gray and, 83; James Lind Alliance, 90, 287–88; leaving Cochrane Collaboration, 89, 89n14; medical training, 17–19, 28; obstetrics and gynaecology, 18, 33–34; Oxman and, 265; randomised trials, pregnancy and childbirth, 33–35; Sackett and, 57, 76, 77, 83–84; synthesising evidence, pregnancy and childbirth, 43–46, 248n5
- Chalmers, Jan, 51
- Chalmers, Thomas, hepatitis patients, 58–59
- change management, 174
- Chartered Institute of Personnel and Development (CIPD), 190n10
- ChatGPT, 12, 172, 258, 285
- Chattopadhyay, Raghavendra, Duflo and, 104
- Chauvin, Derek, 142, 143
- Chicago Tribune* (newspaper), 199
- children: critical thinking, 266n2, 266–67; M&Ms experiment,

- 263–65; parenting interventions, 271–73; screen-time debate, 275–79; smartphone, 275, 276–77; social media, 275–76, 278; Triple P–Positive Parenting Program, 269–71
- Cifu, Adam, 255
- Clark, Justin, 250
- climate change, 12, 153, 158, 166, 169, 170–72, 225n19, 257, 260, 283
- clinical epidemiology, 60–61, 63–65, 68, 69, 74
- Clinical Evidence* (medical book), 158
- clinical trials, 8, 20n1, 24, 27, 28; antibiotics in measles, 18; Chalmers collecting evidence, 35–36; Cochrane, 29–30; random assignment, 25–26; scurvy treatments, 22–23; statistical significance, 38–39. *See also* randomised controlled trials (RCTs)
- Clinical Trial Service Unit, Oxford, 42
- Clinton, Bill, 206; Clinton administration, 203
- Coalition for Evidence-Based Policy, 204, 222, 228
- Cochrane, Archie, 6, 28–32, 44, 45, 46, 47, 59, 261
- Cochrane Centre, 47, 48, 48n13, 53, 234
- Cochrane Collaboration, 8, 50, 50n14, 51–52, 53, 54–55, 84, 89, 116, 117, 151, 154, 157, 172, 175, 182, 233, 234, 241, 248, 254, 260, 286 logo, 54
- Cochrane Library, 52
- Cochrane review, 52, 235, 254
- Cohen, Dick, 31
- Cohen, Jacob, 40
- Cold War, 60
- Collaboration for Environmental Evidence, 157
- collective efficacy, term, 201n1
- College of Policing, 140–41, 141n8, 220
- Collins, Kevan, 211
- Collins, Rory, 42
- Consensus (AI tool), 195–96n14
- Conservation Evidence* website/database, 158–61, 162–63. *See also* evidence-based conservation
- Conservative party rule, 218
- Conservatives, 219
- Cook County Hospital, 56
- corticosteroids, 53
- Council on Criminal Justice, 142
- counterfactual, term, 97n1
- Couzens, Wayne, 144–45
- COVID pandemic, 11, 214; evidence-based management, 196–97; evidence-based medicine, 242–44; evidence community, 256–61; evidence syntheses, 247–49, 251; face masks, 252–56; living reviews, 251–52; randomised trials, drugs and vaccines, 245–46
- Cribsheet* (Oster), 273
- criminology, 126–27
- critical appraisal, clinical literature, 65–68, 69, 73, 86; evidence-based management, 182; Uganda, 239
- Crowley, Patricia, 53
- Cuban Missile Crisis, 60
- Dawn (AI supercomputer), 172
- Deaton, Angus, 112
- Del Mar, Chris, 250
- Demanding Medical Excellence* (Millenson), 130
- Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Sackett, 63–65
- Department for Education (UK), 210, 211n8
- Department of Education (US), 198–99, 201, 207, 208
- Department of Health and Social Security, 31
- depression, 174
- development economics, 10, 94, 106, 108, 110, 115; evidence revolution in medicine and, 107n6
- Dickersin, Kay, 35n4

- Disputatron, 250n8
Dolman, Paul, 154n3
domestic violence, arrest trials, 122–26
Duflo, Esther, 10, 93–95, 206;
background of, 93–94; Banerjee
and, 118; MIT, 94–95, 102–3, 106–7;
randomistas, 10, 108–11; teachers
Kremer and Banerjee, 103
Durham University, 226
- EBM. *See* evidence-based medicine
(EBM)
EBM+, 256, 256n11
Economic and Social Research
Council, UK, 260
economics, development, 10
education: American school system,
198–99; evidence-based, 9–10, 212;
Institute of Education Sciences
(IES), 201, 229; Investing in
Innovation (i3) Fund, 207–8;
investing in pupil premium, 212–13;
research, 198–99, 200–202; teaching
and learning toolkit, 213–14,
213–14n10, 215–17; tutoring, 214,
223; UK government policy and,
210–12; What Works centres,
221–27. *See also* Education
Endowment Foundation (EEF)
Education Endowment Foundation
(EEF), 211–12, 214, 216–17, 218, 220,
222; database of trials, 259n13
Education Innovation and Research
(EIR) programme, 208
*Effective Care in Pregnancy and
Childbirth* (Chalmers, Enkin and
Keirse), 43, 44
Effectiveness and Efficiency
(Cochrane), 31
Elliot Major, Lee, 210, 212, 213, 215–16
Elliott, Julian, 252
Elwood, Peter, 30
eminence-based medicine, 19
empirical evidence, 3, 6–7, 7n1, 9–10,
20–21, 32, 34, 70, 73, 95, 173
Enkin, Murray, 43
environmental crisis, 164
environmental evidence, 154, 157–58.
See also evidence-based
conservation
epidemiology, Sackett, 60–61. *See also*
clinical epidemiology
episiotomy, 44
epistemological trespassing, 131
Evaluation Task Force, 221
Evans, John, 61, 62–63
Everard, Sarah, 144
evidence: absence of, 39n6, 155; term,
7n1. *See also* empirical evidence
Evidence Act, US government, 224
evidence-based, label, 197
evidence-based conservation:
criticism of, 157, 160; evidence-
based management and, 182–83;
radical revolution, 154; term, 154n3
evidence-based management, 176,
176n2, 182–85, 187–89, 193–96;
academics/education, 180–82, 184;
Barends, 174–76, 181–82, 189–93, 195,
196–97; barriers of, 182–85; casual
benchmarking, 185–86; change
management, 174–75; consultants,
184–85; fashions and fads, 186–87;
HR professionals and workforce,
179–83; imposter syndrome,
193–96; Rousseau, 176, 177–78,
180–82, 194–95; talent management,
187–89
evidence-based medicine (EBM), 74,
236–38, 255; COVID pandemic,
242–44; critical appraisal course,
65–68; criticism of, 76–77;
definition, 70; Guyatt, 68–70, 72,
73–74, 76, 81–82, 84–86; *JAMA*
journal, 70–72; McMaster
University, 61, 62, 64–65, 67, 68–70,
73–74, 76, 83–84, 240; pneumococ-
cal pneumonia, 87–88; Sackett,
56–63, 65, 79, 80, 88–90; Semmel-
weis, 74–75, 75n6

- evidence-based policing, 9, 130–33, 137–44
- evidence-based policy, 204, 205–9, 219, 220, 222, 223, 224, 227, 229, 236, 261, 272; criticism of, 224–26
- Evidence-Based Policymaking Act, 224n18
- evidence crisis, conservation, 164
- evidence hierarchy, 78, 85n10
- evidence-informed policy, 205
- evidence reversal, 81
- evidence revolution, 9, 10, 12, 55, 90, 280–82; Barends, 181; becoming partners in evidence, 280–88; climate change, 172; conservation, 154, 173; development economics, 95, 106; empowerment, 12, 279
- evidence synthesis, 5, 8, 11, 36, 41–42n9; 42, 258; artificial intelligence for, 12, 195–96n14, 258–60, 285; basic steps, 43n11; caribou, 167–70; climate change, 171–72; education, 199, 200–201, 217; funding for, 258, 260; living synthesis, 251–52, 252n9; management, 175, 190; methods for, 160–62, 249; pandemic, 247–49; pregnancy and childbirth, 42–43; rapid, 239–40, 249. *See also* Campbell Collaboration; Cochrane Collaboration; Conservation Evidence; systematic review
- Evidence Synthesis Infrastructure Collaborative, 260
- Expecting Better* (Oster), 273
- experimentation, observation and, 7n1, 20
- external validity, 113, 225. *See also* generalisation
- Eysenck, Hans, 37–39, 41
- Facebook, 219
- face masks, debate during pandemic, 252–56
- ‘Face of Wales’ campaign (1993), 129
- Family Firm* (Oster), 273
- Family Support Act, 98
- Faure, J. F., 21, 73
- FDA, 27–28, 204, 244, 280
- Feinstein, Alvan, mentor of Sackett, 61
- field experiments, conservation, 155–58
- Finn, Chester, Jr., 198–99, 201
- Fisher, Ronald, 25
- Fleming, Alexander, penicillin, 24
- Floyd, George, 142–43, 145
- Foundations for Evidence-Based Policymaking Act, 224n18
- Foundations of Success, 167–70
- Functions of the Executive, The* (Barnard), 177
- Gates, Bill, 111
- generalisation, in studies, 113, 123, 157, 168, 183, 223, 225, 239
- George Mason University, Center for Evidence-Based Crime Policy, 142
- Gladwell, Malcolm, 188
- Glass, Gene, 36–42, 41–42n9, 46, 200
- glassings, victims of, 128
- Glazziou, Paul, 249–51; Chalmers and, 66, 66n2; visiting McMaster, 67–68
- Global Evidence Commission, 257–58, 258n12, 259
- Global Evidence Summit, 12, 240–41
- GOBSAT (good old boys sat around a table), 85
- Goldacre, Ben, 40
- Goldstein, Herman, 136
- Google, 176, 219; Google Scholar, 195, 283, 285
- Gordon, Robert, 207
- Gove, Michael, 210
- GRADE, system for clinical recommendations, 85, 85–86n10
- Gray, Muir, 47–48, 83
- Greenhalgh, Trish, 80, 131, 225, 253–54, 256
- greenhouse-gas emissions, 165–66
- Grimshaw, Jeremy, 257

- Gueron, Judith, 95, 99, 116, 205;
Manpower Demonstration
Research Corporation (MDRC),
95, 97–98
- Gustafson, Margaret, 237
- Guyatt, Gordon, 68–70, 72, 73, 74, 76,
77, 81, 82, 84–86, 87n12, 88, 263;
Order of Canada, 73n5; Sackett and,
68, 82
- Gyte, Gill, 44
- Halo Effect, The* (Rosenzweig), 176n2
- Halpern, David, 218
- Handfield-Jones, Helen, 187
- Hard Facts, Dangerous Half-Truths,
and Total Nonsense* (Pfeffer and
Sutton), 178
- Harvard Business Review* (journal),
176, 178, 180, 193
- Harvard University, 95, 234
- Haskins, Ron, 203, 209, 225n19
- Hattie, John, 200–201, 201n2, 212, 215
- Headington Bowls Club, Oxford's, 48
- Hedges, Larry, 39n7, 41n9
- hepatitis, 239; clinical trial, Chalmers,
58–59; patient, Sackett, 57–59
- Her Majesty's Inspectorate of
Constabulary and Fire & Rescue
Services (HMICFRS), 143
- Heywood, Jeremy, 221
- Higgins, Steve, 212–13, 215–17, 217n14
- Highways England, bat bridges, 149
- HiPPO (Highest Paid Person's
Opinion), 180, 180n4
- HIV/AIDS, 234, 235, 238
- HIV prevention, 238
- HMS Salisbury* (British naval
ship), 22
- Home Office, 129
- Horby, Peter, 245
- hormone replacement therapy
(HRT), evidence on, 81–82
- hotspots: Cardiff Model, 135–37; crime
concentration in, 126–27; Minne-
apolis experiment, 127; policing,
132, 133–35, 141, 145–46; procedural
justice, 137–38. *See also* policing
- How Science Takes Stock* (Hunt), 36n5
- HR Magazine*, 180
- human resources (HR): management,
179–80; talent management, 187
- Hunt, Morton, 36n5
- hydroxychloroquine, 243–44, 246
- Imbens, Guido, 102n2
- immunization. *See* vaccines
- imposter syndrome, 181, 193
- India: education trials, 103; immunisa-
tion, 104–5; microcredit pro-
gramme in, 111; Teaching at the
Right Level, 114; tiger counts,
152–53; vaccination rates, 113; village
councils, 103–4
- Indigenous; knowledge, 153, 160–61;
peoples, 160, 167, 169, 236
- infectious diseases, 51, 234, 236, 257
- insect conservation, 155
- Instagram, 276
- Institute for Evidence-Based
Healthcare, 249
- Institute of Education Sciences (IES),
202, 211, 229
- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate
Change (IPCC), 170–72
- Intergovernmental Science-Policy
Platform on Biodiversity and
Ecosystem Services (IPBES), 153n2
- internal validity, 113
- International Agency for Research on
Cancer, 256
- International Collaboration for
the Automation of Systematic
Reviews, 250
- international development, 101, 110,
118, 150
- International Initiative for Impact
Evaluation (3ie), 110, 286
- Investing in Innovation (i3) Fund, 207
- I/O (industrial and organisational)
psychology, 176, 177, 192n13

- Jameel, Mohammed, 108
James Lind Alliance, 90, 287–88
Jasper National Park, 167–70
jaundice, oxytocin and, 34
Jesus and Thomas, biblical story, 193–94
Jim Crow era, 76
Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA), 47, 70–72
J-PAL. *See* Abdul Latif Jameel Poverty Action Lab (J-PAL)
- Kaestle, Carl, 201
Kahneman, Daniel, 267
Kansas City Preventive Patrol Experiment, 120, 120n1
Karlan, Dean, 110
Kefauver-Harris amendments, 28
Keirse, Marc, 43
Kelsey, Frances Oldham, drug approval, 27–28
Kennedy, Robert F., Jr., 281
Khrushchev, Nikita, 60
King, Martin Luther, 119
Klockars, Carl, 120
knee arthritis, 82
knee arthroscopy, randomised trial, 82
Knight, Teri, 151, 154
knowledge brokers, 221, 241
Knowledge is Power Program (KIPP), 207–8, 214n10
Kolind, Lars, 190
Kollerschka, Jakob, 75
Korean War, army hospital, 58
Kremer, Michael, 10, 103, 108n7, 108n8, 114, 115
Kunming-Montreal Global Biodiversity Framework, 173
- Labour party, 219; government, 218
Lancet, The (journal), 76, 266
Landray, Martin, 245
Langhorne, Peter, 52
large language models (LLMs), 172, 258, 259
- Laura and John Arnold Foundation, 223. *See also* Arnold Ventures
Lavis, John, 257, 260
law of crime concentration, 127
Letwin, Oliver, 220–21
Levy, Santiago, evaluating poverty programmes, 99–100
Liberal Democrats, 219
Life Project, The (Pearson), 271n7
Lind, James, 24, 29, 45, 46, 73, 90, 236, 287; experiment to test scurvy treatments, 21–23
López Obrador, Andrés, 101
Lum, Cynthia, 142
Lunceford, Jimmie, 216n12
lung cancer, smoking, 80
- M&Ms experiment, Oxman, 263–65
machine-learning model, 250
McKinsey & Company, 184, 185, 187, 193
McMaster University, 73, 81, 240, 252, 263; Chalmers (Iain) at, 84; critical appraisal teaching, 65–68, 67n3; Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, 63–65; evidence-based medicine timing, 73–74; Guyatt and, 68–70, 74, 84–86; *JAMA* and, 71–72; medical school, 61, 62–63, 110; patient values and preferences, 87–88; Sackett, 63–68, 74, 76, 83
McPherson, Klim, 42
Makerere University, 239
management. *See* evidence-based management
Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation (MDRC), 95, 97–98
March on Washington (1963), 119
Marciniak, Liz, 124
Margolis, Greg, 203
Maryland Partnership for Proven Programs, 228
masks. *See* face masks

- Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), Duflo at, 94–95, 102–3, 106, 108
- master of business administration (MBA), 177, 184
- Matthews, Isabel, 190, 192
- Mazerolle, Lorraine, 137
- Mbeki, Thabo, 235; government, 235
- Medical Research Council: South Africa, 234; UK, 24
- medicine, evidence-based. *See* evidence-based medicine (EBM)
- Medline, 48
- Melbourne Girls Grammar School, 222
- Mercator Research Institute on Global Commons and Climate Change, 171–72
- Meta, company, 179
- meta-analysis, 36–41, 41n9, 42, 46, 78, 191, 195n14, 249, 251, 283; educational studies, 200, 201, 201n2, 212–13, 217n14; pregnancy and childbirth, 43–44, 43n11, 53
- meta-ethnography, term, 160n7
- Metropolitan Police, 9, 144–46
- Mexico: Progresá poverty relief programme, 100–101; poverty in, 99–100
- Michaels, Ed, 187
- Michie, Susan, 164n11
- microcredit, 111–12
- Mijumbi, Rhona, 238n1, 239, 240, 249
- military surgeons, 20
- Millenson, Michael, 130
- Minneapolis: domestic violence experiment, 9, 122; hotspots experiment, 127; police, 126, 142
- Minneapolis Police Department, 122, 142, 143
- Mintzberg, Henry, 179
- Minx, Jan, 171–72
- mixed-methods synthesis, 160
- Monash University, 252
- Moore, Wes, 228
- Mulgan, Geoff, 219–20, 227
- Murray, Alex, 140
- Narasimhan, Vasant, 190
- National Health Service (NHS), Britain's, 30–31, 47
- National Highways, bat bridges, 149
- National Institute for Health and Care Research, UK, 248n7
- National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), UK, 218, 218n15, 220
- National Institute of Justice, 124
- National Institutes of Health, 54, 202, 244, 280
- National Library of Medicine, 48
- National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit, Oxford, 35, 46
- Natural England, 173
- Nature* (journal), 8, 10, 244n3, 275
- Nature Conservancy, 165
- Nesta, 219
- New Labour government, Blair and, 218
- New Scotland Yard, 144, 145
- New York City Police Department (NYPD), 119, 120, 143, 146
- New Yorker* (magazine), 188
- New York Times* (newspaper), 121
- Ngcwabe, Siziwe, 238n1
- Nightingale, Florence, 116
- Nobel Prize: Angrist with Imbens and Card, 102, 102n2; Deaton, 112; Duflo, Banerjee and Kremer, 10, 115; Kahneman, 267
- Northern Ireland, SIDS study, 3
- 'Nothing Works Clearinghouse', 202
- Novartis, 190–93
- Nudge Unit, 219
- Nurse-Family Partnership, 208, 225, 270
- Oakley, Ann, 116
- Obama administration, 206, 207, 207n5, 208, 209

- “obstetric Baader-Meinhof gang,” 45
obstetrics and gynaecology:
Chalmers, 18, 33, 35; Cochrane, 33,
44; Sackett, 59
oedema, Cochrane, 29
Office of Educational Research and
Improvement (OERI), 198, 201
Office of Management and Budget
(OMB), 206–7
Ogilvie, David, 253–54
Oliver, Melvin “Sy,” 216n12
Oportunidades, poverty relief
programme, 101
Order of Canada, Guyatt, 73n5
Orszag, Peter, 207
Oster, Emily, parenting decisions,
273–75, 277
Ostrom, Elinor, 115n13
Oxford Database of Perinatal Trials, 45
Oxford Regional Director of Public
Health, 47–48
Oxford’s Headington Bowls Club, 48
Oxman, Andy, 263–67, 284, 287;
M&Ms experiment, 263–65
oxytocin, jaundice and, 34
pandemic. *See* COVID pandemic
paper mills, 248n6
parenting: claims in, 12–13, 273;
evidence-based programmes, 13,
271–73; Oster and, 273–75; Sanders,
268–70; screens, 275–78; Spock on,
1; Triple P–Positive Parenting
Program, 269–71
Paris Climate Agreement, 171, 280
Parkhurst, Justin, 225n19
Parks Canada, 167–70
pay-for-performance systems, 185
Pearson, Karl, 41n9
Peckham, Michael, 47
penicillin, Fleming, 24
perinatal medicine, Chalmers, 35,
45, 46
Peto, Richard, 42
Petrosino, Anthony, 117
Pfeffer, Jeffrey, 176, 178, 181, 182, 185,
186, 187
Piketty, Thomas, 94
PISA, skills assessment, 222
pneumococcal pneumonia, infection
in lungs, 87–88
pneumonia, allocation bias in clinical
trial, 26
Police Foundation, 120, 130
policing: Cardiff Model, 135–37;
culture of, 141–42; domestic
violence experiments, 122–26;
evidence-based, 138–41; evidence-
based guidelines for, 130–33;
experimental design, 121–26;
Floyd’s murder, 142–43; targeting
crime hotspots, 133–35; three Rs,
119, 120; traditional criminology,
126–27. *See also* hotspots policing;
Minneapolis
policy: arrest, 123, 125; campaign, 228;
climate, 171; evidence-based, 12, 202,
204, 220, 260, 287; government,
116–17; law-enforcement, 142;
social, 9, 93–95, 97, 99, 106–8, 111,
115–16, 121, 203–5, 218, 229, 286.
See also social policy
Politics of Evidence, The (Parkhurst),
225n19
Possingham, Hugh, 165–66
poverty, relief in Mexico, 99–101
Poverty Action Lab, 106
‘pracademics’, police officers, 139
Prasad, Vinay, 255
Pratham (NGO), Teaching at the
Right Level, 114
pre-eclampsia, Sackett on treatment, 59
pregnancy and childbirth, 35, 43, 44,
46, 53n15, 248
Princeton University, 112
procedural justice, 137–38, 142, 145,
192n12
Progresa, poverty relief programme,
100–101
psychometrics, 36

- psychotherapy, 36–37, 39, 40, 41
PsyQ, 174
PubMed, 283
puerperal fever, Semmelweis and, 74–75
pugmark census method, tiger counting, 152
Pullin, Andrew, 150–51, 154, 163n10, 173; Collaboration for Environmental Evidence, 157–58; reviews, 154–55, 157, 161
PwC, 184
- Queen Mary University of London, 191
- racial segregation, apartheid, 233–34, 237
random allocation, Bradford Hill, 25
randomised controlled trials (RCTs)/ randomised trials, 6, 7, 33n3, 78–79, 84, 285; A/B tests, 219; antenatal corticosteroids, 53–54; arrest, domestic violence, 122–25; asthma and breathing exercises, 288; blinding, 26n2; Bradford Hill, 24–27, 60; Chalmers, 32, 33–35, 47; children designing, 264–66; Cochrane Centre, 50; Cochrane on, 28, 30, 32, 44; conservation, 156; COVID pandemic, 244, 245–46; crime prevention, 9, 127–30, 134, 137, 139; criticism of, 77–79, 112–13, 225–26; development economics, 10, 95, 102, 103, 104, 105–8, 110, 112–13, 115, 118; drinking-glass strength, 128–29, 129n4; drugs and FDA, 204–5; EBM+, 256n11; education, 201–2, 208–9, 210–11, 217; evidence hierarchies, 77–78; expansion of, 27–28, 66; external validity, 113; feedback, 191; hepatitis, 58–59; home and hospital births, 79; hormone replacement therapy (HRT), 81; internal validity, 113; knee arthroscopy, 82; masks, 252–55; Novartis, 191, 192; Nudge Unit, 219; Obama evidence initiatives, 208; parenting programmes, 13, 268, 270, 271; performance appraisals, 191; policing, 121, 131, 132, 133; poverty, 109; Progres, 100–101; RECOVERY trial (Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy), 245–46; revolutionised medicine, 106–7; Scared Straight, 117; social policy, 99, 107, 116, 203, 205, 209, 223–24; streptomycin, 24–27; stroke, 52; Teaching at the Right Level, 114; unnecessary or impractical, 79–80, 253–54; vaccines, 11, 104–5, 104n3; Viagra, 225; welfare-to-work programmes, 97–99; workplaces, 183
randomistas, 10, 108–11, 113–14, 115, 118, 206
randophilia, 77
Rational Clinical Examination, 71
Reagan, Ronald, 96, 98, 199; Reagan administration, 96, 97, 123
RECOVERY trial (Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy), United Kingdom's, 245–46
reed beds, 152
Rennie, Drummond, 47, 70–72
replication, 98, 123–25, 182, 207, 208, 209, 223, 226
reproducibility crisis, science, 182n5
respiratory distress syndrome, 53–54
Responsible Research for Business and Management, 182n6
Ridgeway, Greg, 143
RobotReviewer, 250n8
RobotSearch, 250
Rocky Mountains, Canada, 167
Rothamsted Experimental Station, 25

- Röttingen, John-Arne, 260
Rousseau, Denise, 176–78, 180–81, 182, 194–95, 286
Rowley, Mark, 144
Royal Academy of Surgery, France, 21
Royal Society of Medicine, 5–6
Russell, Jill, 225
- Sackett, David, 56–62, 82, 241, 263;
Centre for Evidence-Based
Medicine (Oxford), 83–84;
Chalmers (Iain) and, 83–84; clinical
epidemiology, 60–62; critical
appraisal, 65–68; evidence-based
medicine, 70, 71, 74, 76–80, 89–90;
Guyatt and, 68, 82; hepatitis patient,
57–59; McMaster University, 62–63,
74; problem-based learning, 63–65
Saga Education, 223
Saga tutoring, 223, 226, 229
Salafsky, Nick, 167, 169, 170
salmon and trout, 153
Sanders, Matt, 268; parenting
programmes, 272–73; Triple
P–Positive Parenting Program,
269–71
Sandoz, 192
SARS-CoV-2, 242–43, 257
Scared Straight, 117
Scotland Yard, 9, 144, 145
Scott, Anna Mae, 250
Screenatron, 250
screens, devices, 275–79
screen time, 13, 270, 275–79
scurvy, 21–23, 29, 90, 236, 287
Simmelweis, Ignaz, puerperal fever,
74–75, 75n6
Simmelweis reflex, term, 75
Sense about Science, 284; ‘Ask for
Evidence’ campaign, 282, 283
shared decision-making, 88
Shea, Robert, 206
Shepherd, Jonathan, 128–30, 133, 139n6,
141, 144 218, 241; Cardiff Model,
135–36
Sherman, Lawrence, 119–26,
138–40, 142–43; evidence-based
policing, 130–33; hotspots
policing, 126–27, 134; Scotland
Yard, 144–46; Shepherd and, 128,
130; Weisburd and, 126–27, 132,
132n5
Sherman effect, 138
Show Me the Evidence (Haskins and
Margolis), 203
Siemieniuk, Reed, 252
Smith, Mary Lee, 39, 40–42
Snapchat, 276
social media, mental health and,
275–78
social policy: economics, 93–95, 112, 115;
education, 102–3, 114; immunization,
104–5, 113; poverty, 99–102, 106–11,
113; randomised trials, 112–15; trials
for testing, 111–12, 115–18; welfare,
95–99; women leading, 103–6.
See also policy
Society of Evidence Based Policing,
140
songbird populations, 155
South African Medical Research
Council, 234
South Australia, SIDS cases, 4
Spock, Benjamin, 5, 268; advocacy for
front-sleeping, 1–3, 4; *Baby and
Child Care*, 1
“spray-on evidence,” 218
Stack, Kathy, 207
Stanford University, 176
statistical significance, 38–39
Stellenbosch University, 237–38,
261
Stewart, Ruth, evidence movement,
238–39
streptomycin: randomised controlled
trial, 26–27, 26n2, 33, 58, 123;
tuberculosis (TB), 24
stroke, 8; treatment of, 51–52
sudden infant death syndrome
(SIDS), 2–5, 6, 7, 34

- Sutherland, Bill, 151–52, 154, 154n3, 157, 173; *Conservation Evidence* website, 158–61, 162–63, 163n10; decisions in conservation, 166–67, 285; getting evidence used, 163–64; use of Dawn (AI supercomputer), 172
- Sutton, Robert, 176, 178, 181, 186, 187
- Sutton Trust, 210–11, 211n8, 213
- synthesising evidence, 5, 8, 11, 36, 41–42n9; 42, 258; artificial intelligence for, 12, 195–96n14, 258–60, 285; basic steps, 43n11; caribou, 167–70; climate change, 171–72; education, 199, 200–201, 217; funding for, 258, 260; living synthesis, 251–52, 252n9; management, 175, 190; methods for, 160–62, 249; pandemic, 247–49; pregnancy and childbirth, 42–43; rapid, 239–40, 249. *See also* Campbell Collaboration; Cochrane Collaboration; *Conservation Evidence*; systematic review(s)
- systematic review(s), 8, 13, 36, 42, 43, 46, 47, 52, 78, 117, 160, 185, 283, 285; automating, 250, 258–60; Campbell Collaboration, 116–18; Cardiff model, 137; carbon pricing, 172; Cochrane Center, 47, 49; Cochrane Collaboration, 50–53, 84; conservation, 153, 154, 157, 159, 162; COVID pandemic, 247–49; crime, 133; deworming, 108–9n8; EBM+, 256; education, 213; exposing questionable medical practices, 81–82; international development, 117–18; living, 251–52; management, 175, 183, 185, 190, 195; methods of, 160, 162, 249; notion of, 40; parenting interventions, 271, 272; pregnancy and childbirth, 43–44, 46, 53–54; sleep training programmes, 274; world record, 249–51. *See also* Campbell Collaboration; Cochrane Collaboration
- talent management, 187–88, 188n9
- ‘Teaching and Learning Toolkit,’ 213–18
- Teaching at the Right Level, Pratham, 114
- thalidomide, 27–28
- thiamin (B vitamin), 29
- Times, The* (newspaper), 123
- Todd, Ben, 112n10
- Toolkit, Teaching and Learning, 213–14, 213n10, 214n11, 217–18; class size, 214–15; feedback, 216; metacognition, 214; teaching assistants, 215–16; tutoring, 214
- Tourish, Dennis, 181
- Traill, Barry, 165
- Treatment Action Campaign, 235
- Trends in Ecology and Evolution* (journal), 154n3
- Triple P–Positive Parenting Program, 13, 269–71; Play Well Triple P course, 269n4
- Tröhler, Ulrich, 45
- Trump, Donald, 11–12, 227, 229, 244, 280
- tuberculosis (TB), 24, 234, 239; Cochrane, 30, 33; streptomycin randomised trial, 26–27, 26n2, 33, 58, 123
- tutoring: education, 9, 114, 207, 213, 214, 216, 228; intervention, 226–27n20; maths programme, 223, 226, 229
- Uganda: Centre for Rapid Evidence Synthesis, 239–40, 249; randomised trials, 266, 267
- UK’s Medical Research Council, 24
- Unboss (Bøtter and Kolind), 190
- United Airlines, 186
- United Kingdom (UK): bat conservation, 147; Department for

- Education, 210; Economic and Social Research Council, 260; National Institute for Health and Care Research, 248n7; National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence (NICE), 218, 218n15, 220; RECOVERY trial (Randomised Evaluation of COVID-19 Therapy), 245–46
- United Nations, 17, 153, 260; evidence-based policies, 12
- United Nations Environment Programme, 170
- Universities' Police Science Institute (UPSI), 139n6
- University College London, 163
- University of Birmingham, 150
- University of Bristol, 128
- University of Cambridge, 138, 162, 254
- University of Cape Town, 233
- University of Chicago, 143, 273
- University of Durham, 212
- University of East Anglia, 152
- University of Illinois in Chicago, 60
- University of London, 238
- University of Oxford, 40, 80, 131, 245
- University of Paris, 252n9
- University of Pennsylvania, 111
- University of Queensland, 270n6
- University of Sussex, 181
- UpToDate, 86, 86n11
- USAID, 110
- US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 253
- US Department of Education, 198, 199, 201, 207, 208
- US Department of Health and Human Services, 98–99, 227
- US Department of Justice, 121
- Users' Guides to the Medical Literature, 71, 78, 87n12
- US Food and Drug Administration (FDA), 27, 28, 204
- US National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine, 276, 281
- US National Institutes of Health, 54, 202, 244, 280
- US Public Health Service, 60
- vaccines: childhood, in India, 104–6, 104n3; COVID pandemic, 11, 252n9, 257; measles, 17
- Vallance, Patrick, 260
- van Stralen, Maartje, 164n11
- Vera Institute of Justice, 126
- Viagra, 225
- Visible Learning (Hattie), 201
- vitamin C, 23, 29, 202
- Volmink, Jimmy, 233–35, 237, 241, 242, 245, 261–62
- vote counting, 38–39, 39n7
- Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam, 193
- Wales Universities' Police Science Institute (WUPSI), 139n6
- Wall Street Journal* (newspaper), 180
- War for Talent, The* (Michaels, Handfield-Jones, and Axelrod), 187
- War of the Austrian Succession, 21, 22
- Washington Post* (newspaper), 199, 227
- waste, medical research, 36, 66, 66n2, 243, 257
- Weisburd, David, 126–27, 137, 138; Sherman and, 126–27, 132, 132n5, 135
- welfare reform: Mexico, 99; Reagan administration, 96–99
- West, Robert, 164n11
- Western academic medicine, 19–20
- West Midlands Police, 140
- WhatsApp, 276
- 'What Works' (education report), 198–99, 201, 201n3
- What Works centres, 141n8, 220, 221
- What Works Clearinghouse, 202, 286
- What Works movement, 220, 222, 224, 226, 238, 241
- 'what works' phrase, 219–20
- What Works platform, Baron, 227
- Whitehurst, Russ, 202, 206, 212, 229

- Williamson, Oliver, 115n13
Wolvercote Mill Stream, 46
Woolley, Paul, Jr., blanket experiment, 2
World Bank, 110
World Health Organization, 85–86n10, 137, 243, 246n4, 252, 253, 256, 271
World Meteorological Organization, 170
Yale University, 61, 132n5
Year Up, social programme 223
Young, James “Trummy,” 216n12
ZEBRAs (people with Zero Evidence But Really Arrogant), 180n4
Zedillo, Ernesto, 99, 101
Zimmerman, Ariel, 72, 73
Zoom, 196