Rapid Review Resources

Resources for Rapid Review Methods Guidance

In this document you will find some helpful links to methodological guidance and reporting tools for rapid reviews.

What is a Rapid Review?

A range of terms has been used to describe rapid reviews in the scientific community, including rapid evidence synthesis, rapid literature review, brief review, quick review, rapid systematic review, with rapid review being the most commonly used term.¹

A formal or consensus definition of rapid review does not exist; however, rapid reviews have been described as a type of knowledge synthesis in which components of the systematic review processes are simplified or omitted to produce information in a shorter period of time.²

Watch this two-part Cochrane Learning Live webinar presented by Dr. Andrea Tricco:

- Part 1: Difference between systematic reviews and rapid reviews
- Part 2: An Overview of Rapid Review Methods

List of Rapid Review Guidance Resources

  - Link to guide: Rapid reviews to strengthen health policy and systems: a practical guide
  - Link to teaching slides: Learning Modules

Rapid Review Resources

**Topic Registration**
- **National Collaborating Centre for Methods and Tools**
  This platform can be used to register COVID-19 related rapid review topics. Please also search this database containing to check for redundancy and duplication.

**Protocol Registration Platform**
- **PROSPERO**
  PROSPERO is an international prospective register that accepts protocol for systemic reviews, **rapid reviews**, and umbrella reviews in health and social care, welfare, public health, education, crime, justice, and international development, where there is a health related outcome.
- **OSF Registries**
  Open Science Framework is a free, open platform to support research and enable collaboration.

**Literature Search**
- **CADTH COVID-19 Search Strings**
  CADTH information specialists have developed a peer-reviewed a set of search strings for topics related to COVID-19.
- **CADTH COVID-19 Grey Literature Resources**
  CADTH information specialists have compiled a curated list of grey literature sources.

**Reporting Guidelines**
- **PRISMA Checklist**
  Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) is an evidence-based minimum set of items for reporting of systematic reviews and meta-analyses. The checklist can be used to report rapid reviews as well.

**Engaging Patients and Citizens as Partners in a Rapid Review**

Consider involving patients and public in the following stages of a rapid review:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROTOCOL DEVELOPMENT</th>
<th>SYNTHESIS &amp; WRITING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Involve two or more patients/citizens in the protocol development phase. They can help:</td>
<td>Involve two or more patients/citizens in the interpretation of findings and writing stage. They can help:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Refine the research questions</td>
<td>▪ Provide feedback on the key messages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Define selection criteria (population, intervention, comparison, outcomes)</td>
<td>▪ Co-develop plain language summaries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Prioritize outcomes of importance</td>
<td>▪ Plan for dissemination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Refine data analysis plan (e.g., grouping/sub-grouping population and outcomes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For more information on how to meaningfully and actively collaborate with patients and public in research, please refer to the **Patient and Citizen Engagement Tips** document.