STEP 6 – RAPID REVIEW REPORT STRUCTURE

Notes about style and format:
- The target audience is decision makers.
- Include information on a ‘need to know’ basis (this is not an academic paper).
- Write in sentences, in plain language, as you would speak.
- Check grammar and punctuation.
- Explain definitions of health condition and statistical tests in plain language.
- The report should follow a 1:2:20 format: one page of key messages, a two page executive summary, and an up to 20 page full report.
- Pages should be double spaced, font size 12.

Link to examples of completed rapid review reports: http://www.peelregion.ca/health/library/literature-reviews.asp

Key Messages
This is one page, in bulleted format. Write this section last.
- Provide, in plain language, up to six statements that are the ‘bottom line’ about the practice implications as a result of the rapid review.
- These are derived from the evidence itself as well as the applicability and transferability discussion.

Executive Summary
The length of the executive summary is one to two pages. Write this section after completing the full report.
- Provide a concise overview of the research question, context, methods and results of the literature review, a synthesis of findings and concluding practice recommendations.

Full report
The length of the full report is up to 20 pages.

Issue
The length of this section is up to five to six sentences plus three to five sentences for the anecdote.
- Outline, in plain language, a statement of the practice question. Ask yourself, and answer in this section, why this question is important to address and why has it come about at this point in time?
- Write a short anecdote that describes a public health practice experience to illustrate the need to answer this practice question.
Context
The length of this section is up to one and a half pages. Include only what is relevant for your issue (20 sentences).

- Include available data about the incidence and prevalence of the health issue in Peel. In addition, if available, include any provincial or national data that are relevant.
- Include any information that compares the incidence and prevalence data with those of other relevant jurisdictions.
- Provide definitions for conditions if they would not be widely understood by the target audience.
- Describe any political situations or issues of relevance in the Peel context.
- Describe any community situations or issues of relevance in Peel, including important partnerships that could be affected by any practice or policy change implemented as a result of the review.
- Describe any practice issues that may be directly and/or indirectly affected by this review, for Peel Public Health and other public health organizations.
- Outline the financial and resource implications of any practice or policy change implemented as a result of the review if they may be significant.
- Be sure, when quoting references, to use the primary source or reference and not a secondary reference (e.g. where an agency has quoted a primary reference).

Conceptual framework
The length of this section is up to three sentences.

- Describe how or where the question fits into the conceptual model.
- Append the model in Appendix A.

Literature review question
The length of this section is up to three sentences.

- Include the plain language question and the question in PICO (population, intervention, comparison and outcome) format, as appropriate.

Literature search
The length of this section is five to seven sentences.

- List all sources searched (e.g. websites, databases, reference lists, journals, experts contacted), the date the search was conducted (i.e. month, year), and any search limits (e.g. dates, language, type of paper).
- Append the search strategy in Appendix B.
Relevance assessment
The length of this section is five to seven sentences.
- Describe the process used to assess relevance (e.g. number of assessors, method to resolve any discrepancies).
- List the relevance criteria used to determine which papers to include in the review including inclusion and exclusion criteria,
  - Inclusion criteria are those factors used to determine a paper should be appraised for quality (e.g. the paper is a systematic review, aligns with the elements of the PICO question); exclusion criteria are factors which eliminated papers from critical appraisal (e.g. duplicate, not a systematic review, not within date range, not English language).

Results of the search
The length of this section is three to five sentences.
- Describe the total number of papers of each type which were identified in the search (final version of the implemented search).
- Describe how many articles of each type were found to meet the relevance criteria.
- Append the search results flowchart in Appendix C.

Critical appraisal
The length of this section is six to eight sentences.
- Describe the process used to appraise quality (e.g. the tool used to assess quality, how many reviewers independently completed the assessments and the method to resolve any disagreement in assessment among reviewers).
- Describe how many papers of each type were assessed in each category of weak, moderate or strong quality.
- Include a summary statement stating the final number of papers included in the review, including a statement about any papers that were excluded based on a weak quality score.
Description of included studies
The length of this section is up to ten sentences for each included paper.

- Describe the included papers (usually guidelines or systematic reviews), including: author, year of publication, paper type (e.g. guideline, systematic review), number of studies included if the paper is a synthesis, or number of reviews used to produce it if the paper is a guideline.
- Describe the settings, population, interventions (describe the studied interventions in enough detail so that the interventions could be reproduced), any comparisons, and the outcomes studied if available (do not describe the results or findings here; just describe what the authors studied).
- Append the details (which also include the main findings for each paper) in data extraction tables provided in Appendix D

Link to examples of data extraction tables:
http://www.peelregion.ca/health/library

Synthesis of findings
The length of this section is five to six sentences for each conclusion (depending on number of references supporting each conclusion)

- Interpret the findings of the included papers:
  o Provide an overall summarizing statement for each conclusion (for each outcome or intervention, depending on how you decide to present the findings and include the population studied). Use PICO to think of stating your results. For example, “There was no effect shown among 7-14 year old school children (population) of curriculum based interventions (intervention) compared to educational interventions (comparison intervention) on screen time (outcome)”.  
  o Following the overall statement, describe each of the relevant references that support the finding or conclusion. 
  o Where effects were found, report the magnitude or size of the effect, with applicable statistics for each intervention. Where applicable, interpret the effect size. For example, “At 15-60 months post vaccination, participants who received the HPV vaccine (population) were 64% less likely to develop any cervical lesions (outcome) compared to those not vaccinated (comparison population) (OR 0.36, 95% CI 0.29 to 0.45)”
Draft recommendations (for the draft applicability and transferability paper only)
The length of this section is one sentence per recommendation
- Based on the evidence, provide draft practice or policy recommendations.

Applicability and transferability (to be completed following the A&T meeting)
The length of this section is two to five pages
- Describe the main points which arose from the Applicability and Transferability meeting
- Include any information related to implementing the recommendations in the local setting (e.g. any practice, social, political and resource, and reach implications, whether they are internal or external factors, including the known or expected perspectives of stakeholders).
- Note any next steps identified and assigned responsibilities.

Recommendations
The length of this section is one sentence per decision
- Based on the evidence and the applicability and transferability discussion, outline the recommendations made.

References
Be sure to include all references quoted in your paper in your reference list. For help using write and cite, contact the library.