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**Objectives/aims**

The Campbell Collaboration includes crime, international development, education, and social welfare. It provides high-quality systematic reviews of policy decisions in these areas.We aim to present the current status of the publication of the evaluation of the social welfare system of Campbell Collaboration and provide suggestions for the development of the systematic reviews.We choose systematic reviews of social welfare, using visual analyses of the cooperation between countries, agencies and authors,We use meta-analysis to evaluate the quality of social welfare systematic reviews.

**Methods**

We searched for 57 systematic reviews of social welfare in the Campbell Collaboration before February 2018. We extracted all the information in the systematic reviews and used visual analyses to show the social cooperation relations among the countries, institutions, and authors. The MOOSE table was used to evaluate the quality of the literature. STATA 13.0 software was used to make a meta-analysis of the quality of Campbell social welfare systematic reviews.

**Main findings**

The statistically significant in the number of countries (1 vs. 2) were Item 8 (OR = 33.53 95% CI: 1.6,704.07), Item 12 (OR = 14.35 95% CI: 3.08, 66.93); Fund Support are statistically significant in item 9 (OR = 4.62 95% CI: 1.45, 14.7), item 11 (OR = 16.62 95% CI: 3.32, 83.06), item 12 (OR = 28.83 95% CI: 6.38, 112.91) and item 14 (OR =13.89 95%CI:3.88,49.72) ;only item 16 (OR = 0.05 95% CI: 0.01, 0.44) were statistically significant in the number of institutions (1 vs. 2). The difference in other items was not statistically significant.The results are shown in Table 1.
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