Rapid reviews - Cochrane abstract submission

Title: What's more important - timeliness or accuracy of results in providing evidence? Preliminary results on a research program on rapid reviews

Abstract topic category: Methods for conducting high quality systematic reviews - Methods for special topics (e.g. non-statistical, prognostic, observational studies reviews)

Preferred type of presentation: Oral

Presenting author: Andrea C. Tricco

Contact author: Sharon E. Straus

All authors in correct order:

Andrea Tricco, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Canada

Jesmin Antony, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Canada

Brian Hutton, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Canada

David Moher, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Canada

Donna Ciliska, McMaster Evidence Review and Synthesis Centre, Canada

Sharon Straus, Li Ka Shing Knowledge Institute, St. Michael's Hospital, Canada

[Word limit is 300, total below is 299]

Background: Health decision-makers (including clinicians, patients, and policy-makers) need timely access to health information. Frequently, this information can be obtained from a systematic review; however, the amount of time it takes to complete a systematic review may not suit the needs of some decision-makers. Instead, they may be forced to rely on expert opinion or the results of single studies to make important decisions. Rapid reviews are a form of knowledge synthesis in which components of the systematic review process are simplified or omitted to produce information in a timely manner. Yet rapid reviews might be susceptible to biased results as a consequence of streamlining the systematic review process.

Objectives: To develop a comprehensive list of rapid review methods and categorize each method by feasibility, timeliness, comprehensiveness, and risk of bias.

Methods: Two previous systematic reviews on rapid review methods will be updated by searching electronic databases (e.g., MEDLINE, EMBASE, the Cochrane Library) and conducting targeted Internet searches (e.g., Google). Citations (titles/abstracts) and full-text articles will be screened, and data abstraction will be conducted by two reviewers independently. This list will be supplemented by an electronic survey of international rapid review programs. A comprehensive list of all rapid review methods will be compiled and categorized by feasibility, timeliness, comprehensiveness and risk of bias.

Results: Our research proposal was funded by the Canadian Institutes for Health Research and is currently underway. Preliminary results will be presented at the conference.

Conclusions: Our results will be a first step to understanding how rapid reviews can be used to balance decision-makers' need for accuracy, as well as timeliness. By advancing the methods used in rapid reviews, the quality of health care decision-making will be enhanced, and researchers can better ensure that decisions are based on the best possible evidence.