This is a repository copy of *OP120 Rapid qualitative reviews : a scoping review of guidance and examples*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:
http://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/147373/

Version: Accepted Version

Proceedings Paper:
Campbell, F. orcid.org/0000-0002-4141-8863, Weeks, L., Booth, A. orcid.org/0000-0003-4808-3880 et al. (2 more authors) (2019) OP120 Rapid qualitative reviews : a scoping review of guidance and examples. In: Scarfe, A, Schuller, T, Scott, A, Sikich, N, Tamblyn, D and Vreugdenburg, T, (eds.) International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care. HTAi 2018 VANCOUVER, 01-05 Jun 2018, Vancouver, Canada. Cambridge University Press (CUP) , p. 45.

https://doi.org/10.1017/s0266462318001447

This article has been published in a revised form in International Journal of Technology Assessment in Health Care https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266462318001447. This version is free to view and download for private research and study only. Not for re-distribution, re-sale or use in derivative works. © Cambridge University Press 2018.

Reuse
Items deposited in White Rose Research Online are protected by copyright, with all rights reserved unless indicated otherwise. They may be downloaded and/or printed for private study, or other acts as permitted by national copyright laws. The publisher or other rights holders may allow further reproduction and re-use of the full text version. This is indicated by the licence information on the White Rose Research Online record for the item.

Takedown
If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing eprints@whiterose.ac.uk including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.

eprints@whiterose.ac.uk
https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/

OP120 Rapid Qualitative Reviews: A Scoping Review Of Guidance And Examples

AUTHORS:

Fiona Campbell, Laura Weeks (LauraW@cadth.ca), Andrew Booth, David Kaunelis, Andrea Smith

INTRODUCTION:

Decision-makers are increasingly recognizing the usefulness of qualitative research to inform patient-centered policy decisions, and are accordingly increasingly demanding qualitative evidence as part of health technology assessment (HTA). In the context of tight HTA timelines, a new form of evidence synthesis has emerged—rapid qualitative reviews. The need for rapidity requires either an increase in resources or, more commonly, a compromise in rigor, yet guidance on appropriate compromises for qualitative reviews is lacking.

METHODS:

In order to inform de novo guidance, we conducted a systematic scoping review to identify existing guidance and published examples of rapid qualitative reviews. We searched Medline and CINAHL using medical subject headings and keywords related to “rapid reviews” and “qualitative” research, and screened the 1,771 resultant citations independently in duplicate. Additionally, we searched the grey literature and solicited examples from our contacts and other evidence-synthesis organizations. We summarized included guidance and reviews using the Search, AppraisaL, Synthesis, Analysis (SALSA) framework to identify abbreviations in the review process.

RESULTS:

We found no guidance documents specific to rapid qualitative reviews. We found one published peer-reviewed rapid qualitative review, and several more (>10; grey literature search in process) through our organizational contacts. While methods to abbreviate the process are poorly reported, an abbreviated literature search (years and databases searched) and the use of a single reviewer appear common.

CONCLUSIONS:

A number of agencies are producing rapid qualitative reviews, however our review identifies the urgent need to develop and explore methods for the synthesis of qualitative research that balance rapidity and rigor.