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INTRODUCTION

We have to make a decision. But..... We are in a hurry.
To compile and review literature about rapid products (RP)

To analyse what are known for RP

To review and analyse recommendations from the main agencies

“Rapid products at a glance”
METHODS

Narrative review of literature

Selection of institutions

Search for available recommendations

Analyse of key points
OUTCOMES: DEFINITION PROBLEM

✔ Terminological diversity: rapid review vs rapid product
✔ Many definitions
OUTCOMES: SOME EXAMPLES OF DEFINITIONS

RRs are literature reviews that use methods to accelerate or streamline traditional systematic review processes [Ganann 2010]

RR products are intended to synthesize available evidence and meet the time constraints of healthcare decision-makers [Featherstone 2015]

RRs are a form of knowledge synthesis in which components of SR process are Simplified or omitted to produce information in a timely manner [Khangura 2012]

RRs are efforts to assess and synthesize evidence in less time than traditional “full” SR [Academy Health’s Rapid Evidence Review Project 2015]

And many more...
OUTCOMES: TOO MANY DEFINITIONS!!!
OUTCOMES: DOCUMENT RETRIEVAL

Total number of documents about rapid products

- Rapid response
- Knowledge synthesis
- Rapid evidence/assessment
- Review of reviews
- Mapping of reviews
- Synthesis of evidence
- Umbrella reviews
- Map of evidence
- Realist evidence
- Summary of abstracts
- Evidence summaries
- List of references
- Rapid review
- Scoping review
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OUTCOMES: OVERLOAD OF DOCUMENTS AND HETEROGENEITY!!!
OUTCOMES: WHAT DO AGENCIES TELL US?
Welcome to the Cochrane Rapid Reviews Methods Group (RRMG) website. The RRMG is one of 17 Cochrane Method Groups world-wide comprised of individuals with an interest and expertise in the science of systematic reviews.

While the concept of rapid evidence synthesis, or rapid review (RR), is not novel, it remains a poorly understood and as yet ill-defined set of diverse methodologies supported by a paucity of published, available scientific literature. The speed with which RRs are gaining prominence and are being incorporated into urgent decision-making underscores the need to explore their characteristics and use further. While rapid review producers must answer the time-sensitive needs of the health decision makers they serve, they must simultaneously ensure that the scientific imperative of methodological rigor is satisfied. In order to adequately address this inherent tension, a need for methodological research and standard development has been identified. For these reasons, we have established the Cochrane Rapid Reviews Methods Group (RRMG) to better inform ‘rapid review’ methodology.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protocol</th>
<th>AHRQ</th>
<th>CADTH</th>
<th>KCE</th>
<th>?</th>
<th>?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Timeframe</td>
<td>1 week-8 months</td>
<td>Days - 6 months max.</td>
<td>6 months max.</td>
<td>Days – several months</td>
<td>4 months max.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Screening</td>
<td>Single author if necessary</td>
<td>Single author + internal review also from IS</td>
<td>Peer reviewed</td>
<td>1 author + internal review</td>
<td>Peer review if possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shortcuts</td>
<td>Scope, date, sources (databases, grey literature), English</td>
<td>Scope, date, sources (databases, grey literature), English</td>
<td>Scope, date, sources (databases, grey literature), language</td>
<td>Scope, date, sources (databases, grey literature), language</td>
<td>?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sources</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>Pubmed; CL; CRD; major international HTA websites</td>
<td>Medline; Embase; Cinahl, and specific case by case</td>
<td>Medline; Embase; Central. Can be reduced if necessary</td>
<td>Suggested to focus on the pyramid of evidence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Specialist (IS)</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>“Extremely useful for Scoping reviews”</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>“Consider a librarian for the scope or search”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transparency</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End users</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OUTCOMES: AND AGAIN, WIDE VARIABILITY OF NAMES, TYPES, DEFINITIONS AND METHODS…

- Inventories
- Rapid responses
- Rapid reviews
- Automated approaches

**CADTH** Evidence Driven.
- Reference List
- Summary of abstracts
- Summary with critical appraisal
- Peer-reviewed summary with critical appraisal
- Rapid SR and meta-analysis
- Rapid HTA

- Umbrella reviews
- Scoping reviews
- Mixed methods reviews

Key points of interest
- AHRQ: to create a repository for RR
- CADTH: PRESS _ Peer Review for Electronic Search Strategies
- WHO: Text mining techniques
- Big differences about how deep or detailed are those guidelines
OUTCOMES: NO CONSISTENCY IN THE METHODS AND RECOMMENDATIONS
Rapid Review Summit: Then, Now, and in the Future Summary Report Available

Published on: May 25, 2015  Result type: News

In February 2015, CADTH hosted the Rapid Review Summit: Then, Now, and in the Future, in partnership with the British Columbia Ministry of Health, the Centre for Clinical Epidemiology and Evaluation (C2E2), the Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, and the University of Pennsylvania.

The purpose of the Summit was to focus on the evolving role of rapid reviews to support informed health care policy and clinical decision-making, including the uptake and use of health technology assessment. Approximately 150 participants attended, including knowledge producers and users of rapid reviews from a wide range of research and practice settings across Canada and internationally.
EVOLUTION

- Taxonomy
- Accuracy
- Appropriate
- Evaluation
- Repositories
- Tools and guidelines for consistency and uniformity
PRISMA: INITIATIVES FOR REPORTING

Enhancing the QUALity and Transparency Of health Research

PRISMA-RR: an extension to PRISMA for rapid reviews (registered 4 November 2015)

This reporting guideline will address reporting for rapid reviews, including those with analogous terminology (e.g., rapid evidence synthesis, rapid knowledge synthesis).

- Read the project protocol (February 2018)
- September 2017 update: stage 1 of the guidance is for rapid reviews that include primary studies. Following completion of stage 1, guidance for rapid reviews that include secondary evidence, such as systematic reviews, will be developed and aligned with the development of the PRIOR reporting guideline (currently under development).
- Contact: Adrienne Stevens, adstevens@ohri.ca

Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR) (registered 18 December 2015)

The objective is to develop a guideline to standardize the reporting of scoping reviews – Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analysis extension for Scoping Reviews (PRISMA-ScR).

- Read the executive summary
- Website: http://www.prisma-statement.org/ExtensionsInDevelopment.aspx
- Contact: Andrea C. Tricco PhD, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute of St. Michael's Hospital, 209 Victoria Street, Toronto, Ontario, M5B 1W8, Canada, triccoa@smh.ca
EVIDENT Guidance for Reviewing the Evidence: a compendium of methodological literature and websites

Dr Andrew Booth, BA Dipl Lib MSc PhD MCLIP School of Health & Related Research(SChARR), University of Sheffield, United Kingdom for and on behalf of the EVIDENT Project

Rapid-Reviews.info

**Value of Information to help with the SR v RR debate?**
I posted a post-Evidence Live blog last week which explored the notion of harms associated with doing rapid reviews (RRs). There is overlap from that post but I’ve had time to reflect and hopefully this will be better written. I’ve also added a vote! It may need re-writing again, if you think it needs clarification then please let me know! The question I was asked … Continue reading
JUNE 26, 2018 / 2 COMMENTS

**Systematic versus rapid reviews – what about harms?**
I was at the wonderful Evidence Live and presented on rapid reviews. One question came from the wonderful Iain Chalmers who asked about the potential for harm if health professionals followed the advice of a RR that was subsequently shown to be wrong. Later, in conversation, it became clear that ‘wrong’ meant a reversal of conclusion – so the SR might say the intervention is … Continue reading
JUNE 21, 2018 / 1 COMMENT

Categories
- Article review
- Autosynthesis
- Background
- Commentary
- Community rapid review
- Comparisons
- Event
- Example Rapid Review
- Example RRs
- List of articles
- New article
- Overview
**CONCLUSIONS - REFLEXIONS**

- There is not an accepted and validated terminology and taxonomy.
- The number of guidelines and recommendations about how to perform rapid products has increased extremely, however there is any consensus.
- Most of the recommendations highlighted the importance of being transparent (reporting!).
- End-users of rapid reviews should be consider from the beginning and at any stage of the development of any rapid products.
- Finally, a repository for those kind of products should be developed (but who could/should be in charge?)
TO BE CONSIDERED...

Synergy

Information specialist vs other specialists?

Responsibility and commitment
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